



# ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯಪತ್ರ

ಅಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾದುದು

ಸಂಪುಟ - ೧೫೬ Volume - 156	ಕಲಬುರಗಿ, ಶುಕ್ರವಾರ, ೨೫, ಜೂನ್, ೨೦೨೧ (ಆಷಾಧ ೦೪, ಶಕಾವರ್ಷ ೧೯೪೩) KALABURAGI, FRIDAY, 25, JUNE, 2021 (ASHADHA 04, ShakaVarsha 1943)	ಸಂಚಿಕೆ ೪೨ Issue 42
-----------------------------	--	-----------------------

ಭಾಗ ೬-ಸಿ

ಕಲಬುರಗಿ ವಿಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕಲಬುರಗಿ, ಬಜಾರ, ರಾಯಚೌರು, ಬೀದರ, ಕೊಣ್ಣಳ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾದಗಿರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ  
ಸ್ಥಳೀಯವಾಗಿ ಅನ್ನೆಯವಾಗುವ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಆಸನಬಧ್ಯವಲ್ಲದ ಆದರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣ  
ಶಾಸನದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಗಳ ಸಹಿತವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಗಳು

THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,  
AT BIDAR.

DATED: THIS THE 7<sup>th</sup> DAY OF APRIL 2021

PRESENT:

Sri Kadloor Satyanarayananacharya.  
M.Sc.LL.B (Spl.)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

REFERENCE NO.10(1)(c)2/2019  
(Old Reference No.10(1)(c)/1/2018)

CLAIMANTS:

1. Mahananda W/o Vishwanah, age 44 years, occupation:  
Junior Asst. /Ledger Maintenance Clerk, R/o  
Humnabad Sub Division, GESCOM, Humnabad, R/o  
Fatimapur Post Chitgappa, Tq. Humnabad, Dist. Bidar.
2. Rajappa S/o Naganna, age 41 years, occupation:  
Jr. Asst./Ledger Maintenance Clerk, Sub Division,  
GESCOM Bidar, R/o H.No. 19-1-222, Mahadev  
Colony, Shivanagar (S), Bidar.

3. Ravidnranath S/o Vaijinath, age 40 years, occupation: Jr. Asst./Leger Maintenance Clerk, Sub Division, GESCOM Bidar, R/o Nirna, Tq. Humnabad, Dist. Bidar.
4. Sharanappa S/o Nagashetty S/o Vaijinath, age 50 years, occupation: Jr. Asst./ Ledger Maintenance Clerk, Sub Division GESCOM, Bidar, R/o Shiva Shree Nilaya, near Papnash Gate, Shivanagar (North), Bidar.
5. Jyotish Jagee S/o Shreepad, age 44 years, occupation: Jr. Asst./Leger Maintenance Clerk, GESCOM, Sub Division, Humnabad, Dist. Bidar, R/o H. No.11-226, Humnabad 585330, Dist. Bidar.
6. Sandesh S/o Venkatrao, age 43 years, occupation: Jr. Asst./Leger Maintenance Clerk, GESCOM, Sub Division, Bidar, R/o Krishna Kunj, Shiva Nagar, Bidar 585021.
7. Chandakanth S/o Baburao, age 40 years, occupation: Jr. Asst./ Ledger Maintenance Clerk, GESCOM Sub Division, Bidar, R/o Markunda 585227.
8. Sharanabasappa S/o Shivaputtrappa, age 38 years, occupation: Jr. Asst./ Ledger Maintenance Clerk, Ambalaga, Tq. Aland, Dist. Kalaburagi.

**(By Sri P. Vilashkumar/S.B. Waddi,  
Advocates)**

-VERSUS-

#### **RESPONDENTS:**

1. The Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. Through its Managing Director, Kaveri Bhavan, Bengaluru-9.
2. The General Manager (Adm. & HRD), Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd., Kaveri Bhavan, Bengaluru-9.
3. The Gulbarga Electricity Supply Company Ltd., Kalaburagi, through its Managing Director, Opp: Pariwar Hotel, main road, Kalaburagi 585102.

4. The General Manager, Administration and Human Resource Department, GESCOM, Main road, Kalaburagi 585002.
5. The Chief Engineer, Gulbarga Electricity Supply Company Ltd., (Electrical) main road, Kalaburagi 585102.
6. The Superintendent of Engineer, GESCOM, Bidar 585201.
7. The Executive Engineer (O & M Division), GESCOM, Bidar 585201.

**(R1 & R2 by Sri Santosh V. Bargale,  
Advocate)  
(R3 to R7 by Sri M. S. Patil, Adv.)**

### **JUDGMENT**

1. This a reference U/Sec. 10(1)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, of the claimants first party workmen against the respondents directing the respondents to reinstate the first party claimants into service and to continue the services of the petitioners by allowing them by resuming duty by treating them to be permanent employees from their respective date of initial appointments and extend all the consequential benefits flowing in the interest of justice.
2. The brief facts of the case are that, the first party claimants being employees of respondents have joined together for raising the dispute on the ground that, issues involved and cause of action accrued to them and the claim made by is one and the same, since respondents have failed to regularize their services as was done with other similarly situated employees in a phased manner. It is pleaded that, for raising the dispute before the Conciliation Officer of Labour Department, factual report was obtained and after failure of conciliation proceedings, Conciliation Officer made a recommendation to Labour Commissioner, Karnataka Government, was pleased to refer the dispute to the

Labour Court by its order dated 14-12-2017 to consider whether the termination of services of first party claimants was justified, as per Annexure-A. During the year 1997 to 1999 number of vacancy for the post of Gangmen, meter reader, work of ledger maintenance through the State of Karnataka in the organization of respondents who are carried out activities of production of electricity and supply of electricity in the State of Karnataka, wherein respondents no.3 to 5 are managing and controlling the Hyderabad Karnataka Region. In order to over come the shortage of these hands, had adopted resolution authorizing the Chief Engineer and Executive Engineer to engage the gangmen, meter reader and ledger maintenance works on merit basis which resolution is also aimed at resorting for unfair labour practice as well as exploiting the less bargaining capacity of the employees. To the existing vacancy of 1400 all these cadres, 1274 gang men, 35 meter readers, 91 vacancies of ledger maintenance workers was there and same were appointed by Chief Engineer, GESCOM, Kalaburagi, as per the direction and approval of the Board. Therefore, in order to over come the labour legislation adopted the practice of issuing periodical appointment orders giving one day or two days break now and then.

2.1) It is further case of the first party claimants after formation of respondent no.3 company, the first party claimants were continued with the approval of the board and their services was extended from time to time by issuing appointment orders. The first party claimants being very poor had no better choice except agreeing to the conditions unilaterally imposed by the respondents. Had they not agreed for such unfair labour practice and illegal conditions, they would not have had square meals even for those 9 to 14 years, all the first party claimants are more qualified than the required qualification for the post they were holding and all of them have been appointed after due interview in the year 1999. The details of their qualification date of appointment are mentioned in Annexure -B.

2.2) It is further submitted that, there were instances wherein Junior Engineers who were appointed against the permanent vacancy and were branded as temporary were later on ordered to be regularized by resolution passed by the KPTCL. Their regularization was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka which was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court validity of the resolution for the regularization of temporary Junior Engineers. Similar writ petitions were filed they were also in favour of the employees. Later on, the respondent Board adopted a resolution for regularization of service of such of the employees in general particularly who were working as gangmen on temporary basis who have put in more than 3 years or 6 years of services. They also adopted another resolution the persons who have been put in service of 3 years as temporary, badali or contract basis will be converted as probationers of permanent basis and thereafter their services will be regularized. Similarly, many gangmen and meter readers were also regularized. It is further pleaded that, regularizing services of employees in the phased manner has been practice under the respondents. However, they were doing at their whims and on extraneous consideration. In the similar case of this nature some of the persons whose services was not regularized, they have raised Industrial Dispute before the Labour Court, Kalaburagi and ultimately Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka pleased to order for regularization and when the said order was challenged by the respondents before the Division Bench the order passed by the Hon'ble Single Judge has been confirmed as per Annexure- C.

2.3) It is further pleaded that, these claimants were paid wages through acquaintance roll till 2009. But from 2009 to 2012-13 they were not paid wages through acquaintance roll but were paid wages in cash and in some case salary was paid in the name of outside agencies with nominal and artificial breaks. By this method they gave an impression to the

petitioners that they would will not be terminated from service and they will continue their service and will be treated to have been appointed against the permanent vacancy from the respective dates of initial appointment. Therefore, under these circumstances, these claimants could not immediately approach the Court this position of less bargaining capacity of the petitioners has been exploited. The earlier decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka of the Division Bench was further taken by the respondents to the Hon'ble Supreme Court which came to be dismissed as per Annexure – D. It is stated that even in April 2013 petitioners were informed that their service will be regularized in a phased manner and they somehow systematically prevented from coming to the duty, therefore, when the respondents did not take up the matters of these claimants. When admittedly, other similarly placed employees have been regularized, these claimants cannot be singled out to deny the same benefits. Therefore, ultimately this petition is filed. It is submitted that, the respondents being an instrumentalities of State coming under Article 12 of Constitution of India are not supposed to act arbitrarily and they cannot be engaging of consolidated employee, temporary employee or contractual employee as against perennial in nature of work. The respondents is not business undertaking, nor it is doing any trade, as such, is required to act fairly without arbitrariness. It is further submitted that, even before Conciliation Officer respondent did not deny the relationship, on the other hand, took no specific defence. Therefore, under these circumstances, the claimants have prayed to answer the reference holding that the respondents are not justified in punishing the employees without regularization, consequently pass the award directing the respondents to continue service of the petitioners and reinstate them, with all consequence benefits.

3. In response to service of notice, respondents have put in their appearance, respondents no.1 and 2 have filed joint statement contending that the KPTCL prior to being

various ESCOMS prior to 01-06-2002 due to there being no direct recruitment had approved specific number of appointments for specific work for specific period as per requirement of the O & M officers. The KPTCL on 30-04-2002 has authorized the Chief Engineer, (Electric) Kalaburagi Division, Kalaburagi, (presently GESCOM) to appoint various persons for various service from 02-04-2002 to 30-09-2002 and after separate of KPTCL from 01-06-2002 no permission have been granted by KPTCL to engage persons on contract basis. Each of the companies have their own Managing Director and function independently and it is seen that, the respective GESCOM from time to time engaged such service as per their requirement. All the above mentioned companies are fully owned independent government companies who work under their memorandum and articles of association having powers and authority to take decisions, even their area of operation is subject to the MOA/AOA and the directions and orders issued by the government. It is further contended that, the KPTCL was divided into GESCOM, the KPTCL employees union had requested for regularization of services of 7528 gang men and State Government on 02-03-2004 published its decision dated 01-04-2003 to regularize only those gangmen who have worked for 6 years, and accordingly they have been regularized and taken as probationary Mazdoors and after probationary they have been absorbed as junior linemen as per order dated 06-11-2004. It is further stated that, the petitioners have been working at GESCOM and that the KPTCL had approved specific number of persons to be engaged, as such they have no records pertaining to these petitioners. It is contended that, there is no post of either gangmen or ledger maintenance either in the KPTCL or in the GESCOM. According to them, after 01-06-2002 the KPTCL has not granted any approval for appointment on temporary basis. However, they admitted that prior to 01-06-2002 as per the request of the Chief Engineer, Electrical, approval was given for engaging employees

for various services for specific work and for specific project. Therefore, prayed for dismissal of the reference.

4. The respondents no.3 to 6 in their objection statements have pleaded that, they are carrying out business of transmission distribution of electricity in the State of Karnataka and their activities are confined to Hyderabad Karnataka Region. It is denied that, there were number of vacancy as pleaded in para-3 during the year 1997-99. It is contended that, the post of gangmen and ledger maintenance work are not sanctioned post. The Chief Engineer had engaged the ledger maintenance worker on contract basis for a temporary period as soon as the work is completed, their services are stands terminated automatically. It is denied that the Chief Engineer, GESCOM, Kalaburagi, had appointed 1274 gangmen, 35 meter readers and 91 ledger maintenance workers during the year 1998-99. It is denied that, the respondents no.3 to 6 were issuing appointment orders for a periodical period in order to over come the labour legislation. It is denied that after formation of respondent no.3, the workers were continued their work with the approval of the Board and the Chief Engineer and their services were extended from time to time.

4.1) It is denied that the said employee were issued appointment orders individually. It is denied that the petitioners had no other better choice except agreeing to the conditions unilaterally imposed by the respondents. It is submitted that the petitioners were not appointed against the sanctioned post, but they were engaged on temporary contract basis for particular work and for a particular period. The petitioner no.8 was not engaged in respondent no.7's office. It is denied that, the petitioners are fulfilling all the constitutional and legal requirements for being appointed as ledger maintenance workers, that there were no ledger maintenance workers post in the respondent company. The order of regularization in respect of junior engineers by the Hon'ble High Court is not relevant to the present

petition, hence that judgment cannot be made use by these petitioners. The facts of the said cases are different from the fact of these petitioners as these petitioners were engaged on contract basis for temporary period, hence question of regularization does not arise. The services of the petitioners except petitioner no.8 were engaged on contract basis ended as soon as the work was completed and they were no more in service with respondents. Hence, question of regularization does not arise.

4.2) It is denied that, in the year 2012-13 no termination order was issued to the petitioners. It is denied that the petitioners were paid wages till 2009 by maintaining master roll, but from 2009-2012 they were paid wages in cash. It is denied that in some cases salary was paid in the name of outside agencies and because of that reason on their continued service they could not immediately knock the doors of the Court rather their position was exploited they having less bargaining capacity.

4.3) It is denied that, in the month of April 2013 the petitioners were told by the respondents that their services will be regularized in a phased manner after receipt of the communication from respondents no.1 and 2 and thus prevented them from coming to the duty. It is denied that, similarly situated employees i.e. junior engineers, gangmen, meter readers, ledger maintenance workers have been appointed against permanent vacancy and have been paid salary on regular basis, whereas these petitioners have been singled out denying the benefits. It is denied that, the respondents being instrumentality of state have acted arbitrarily and irrational in violation of Articles 14, 21 and 23 of Constitution. On these main grounds, they have contended that, the petition is deserves to be dismissed as claim is barred by limitation.

5. Based on the pleadings of the parties, initially the following two issues have been framed on 04-04-2019 by the District Judge & Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Kalaburagi,

when the matter was pending on the file of that Court, and one additional issue has been framed by the said Court on 28-05-2019;

### **ISSUES**

- 1) Whether respondents are justified in terminating the services of the petitioners without regularizing them?
- 2) What order/ Award?

**Addl. Issue:** Whether respondents 3 to 6 prove that the claim is time barred?

6. The official of claimant no.1 has been examined on his behalf and on behalf of others as WW.1 and Ex.W.1 to Ex.W.16 have been marked and closed their side. The official of respondents no.1 and 2 has been examined as MW1 and got marked Ex.M1 has been marked, whereas, official of respondents no.3 to 6examined as MW2 Basavaraj Patil and got marked Ex.M2, Ex.M3 to Ex.M.7 and closed their side.

7. I have heard the arguments on both sides and same is now posted for judgment.

8. My findings to the above issues are as under:

**Issue No.1: In negative,**

**Addl. Issue No.1: In negative,**

**Issue No.2: As per final order,** for the following;

### **REASONS**

9. **Issue No.1 & Addl. Issue No.2:** These issues are taken up together for better appreciation of factual aspects and the evidence placed on record.

10. It is definite case of the petitioners that, respondents were carrying out the activities of production of electricity and supply of electricity in the State of Karnataka is an instrumentality of State coming under Article 12 of the Constitution of India. On perusal of the Ex.P.1 circular marked through MW1 establishes this contention of the petitioners.

As per this Ex.M1 para-5(b) it is clear that, government announced polices in furtherance to reform process. As per para-5(c) circular government took a policy decision to unbundled distribution function from KPTCL, leaving to KPTCL its main statutory functions, such as transmission, system operation, power planning and coordination of grid functions and as per para-5(d) of the circular, four independent distribution companies i.e. electricity supply companies were formed during April 2002 on regional basis and GESCOM happened to be one of those companies with its headquarters at Gulbarga now known as Kalaburagi. These companies were fully functional under the second transfer scheme erstwhile KEB reorganization under the Karnataka Electricity Reform Act 1999 with external arrangement KPTCL in bulk power supply through commercial agreements and distribution was taken up by the respective companies formed under these scheme. In para-11 of the circular, it has been clearly mentioned that, all the above mentioned companies are fully owned independent government companies who work under their Memorandum of Articles of Association, licenses, orders, directions issued by the KERC and the State of Karnataka. It is further made clear that, the Board of Directors of these companies have the full powers and authority to take decisions within their area of operation, subject to the MOA/AOA and the directions and orders issued by the Government/KERC. This makes very clear that, though these divisions are made in the form of companies with definite area of operation, their operation and control is as per the directions and orders issued by the Government under the Karnataka Electricity Reform Act, 1999. Therefore, their functions has to be transparent in all respect leaving little scope for the official functionary work under the banner of independent companies to pass orders at their whims and fancies.

11. It is further clear from Ex.M2 dated 12-12-2007 by virtue of official memorandum approval was given by the General Manager (Administrative & HRD), GESCOM, Gulbarga, to take services contract workers Junior Assistant, contract meter readers. It is further clear that, O & M Division Bidar, 25 ledger maintenance workers and 7 meter reader works was approved, based on that, the appointments have been made. It is further clear from Ex.W1 proceedings of the meeting dated 31-07-1998 Board was pleased to delegate the powers to Zonal Chief Engineers, electricity, to engage men on temporary basis for various activities such as execution of Capital works, maintenance of T &D network, service station works, maintenance of stores and any other related works. For the entire Gulbarga Zone 750 men were allowed to be recruited on contract basis on consolidated monthly remuneration of RS.2,500/- in Malnad and coastal areas, and Rs.1,553/- in other areas, by taking agreement in the prescribed format on a Rs.100/- stamp paper and their services were to expire by 31-12-1998. It is further clear from Ex.W2 that of such workers who were engaged on contract basis, they were made permanent. The letter clearly goes to show that, consequent to formation of GESCOM w.e.f 01-06-2002, the Chief Engineer (EL), Gulbarga Zone, Gulbarga, had sought approval for fresh engagement of contract workers directly and that from time to time on every 6 months further approval was given by order dated 03-04-2003 to 30-09-2003 duly breaking one or two days in each spell on the recommendation of concerned Zonal/Divisional Officers. This letter also refers to the direction issued by the KPTCL to the effect that, gangmen who were working as on 01-04-2005 shall not be discontinued or dispensed for want of renewal/extension as per order dated 28-04-2005. It is further clear that, the gangmen who have completed six years of continuous service in the division on 01-04-2005 has been completed as probationary/Mazdoors from time to time. It is further clear that there were any such

gangmen in this GESCOM to service under graduation for ledger maintenance works and meter readers were extended for a period of six months from time to time. Therefore, based on the decision taken, 77 direct workers for ledger maintenance works and 34 contract workers for meter readers works (persons actually working) from 02-04-2007 to 30-09-2007 the approval was given for continuation of their services. Whereas, so far as engaged on contract basis prior to 31-03-2001 they have been regularized as gangmen as per resolution No.4/9 of the Board of Directors meeting dated 07-07-2003.

12. From Ex.W8 it is clear that, the first party claimants were found in the list of ledger maintenance working as on 11-11-2008. That gives an indication that, as on that day, they were working in the respondents organization. It is further clear from Ex.W16 that as per the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP No.47435 - 47447/2012 dated 23-11-2012 and another High Court passed in WP No.47587 – 47591/ 47435- 47448/47461 - 47498 of 2012 and 8713 to 87421/2013 the respondents were directed to regularize the petitioners of those writ petitions. Accordingly, under this resolution Ex.M.16 the Board decided to approved the regularizing of those petitioners as per the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and resolved to comply with the direction of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in totality and had also resolved to regularize the services of contract Assistant Engineers (Ele) and contract Junior Engineers (Ele) appointed on contract basis.

13. Now according to this first party claimants that, while regularizing those persons who had filed a writ petition, these first party claimants were singled out and their services is not regularize in spite of representation and even after approaching before the Conciliation Officer by raising a dispute and ultimately since the conciliation failed, the Government of Karnataka was pleased to refer the dispute to this Court by its order dated 14-12-2007. This fact has been admitted by the respondents in their counter and also evidence. This reference itself has not been challenged by the respondents as on today.

14. During the course of cross-examination of MW.1 and MW.2, MW.1 who is official from respondents no.1 and 2 has admitted that since 15 years, he is working in KPTCL and he knew the facts of the case. He has also further admitted that, while submitting their reply before the Conciliation Officer, they had not raised the defence of delay before the Conciliation Officer. He has also admitted that, approval was given on 30-04-2002 for appointment of ledger clerks, but he pleaded his ignorance how may post approval was sought. According to him, those particulars will be available with the corporation. He has also further admitted that, how the first party claimants workers were appointed and the period for which their services was approved will be available with the corporation. Admittedly, those relevant documents have not been produced by the respondents. Therefore, as rightly canvassed by the learned counsel for the first party claimants, the adverse inference will have to be drawn. In this behalf, the ruling relied upon by the learned counsel for the first party claimants, reported in **ILR 1994 Karnataka 2728 in Writ Appeal No.1918/1994 between Management of State of Bank of India Vs. V.M. Mahapurush**, so far as it relates to drawing of adverse inference is applicable to the facts of the present case. As pointed out earlier, in Ex.W.8 in the column the mode of appointment is mentioned as “ನೇರವಾಗಿ” meaning thereby directly. This column no.11 refers to whether the persons who are working as ledger clerks were appointed directly or on the basis of contract in that column as against the name of these first party claimants it is mentioned as directly. This itself show that, the respondents have come up with the defence contradictory to their own documents of undisputed of time. Therefore, Ex.W.13 has no relevance. Regarding the competence and education qualification of first party claimants/applicants to work in the particular cadre and work that was extracted by the respondents no.3 to 6 is

---

clarified and answer has been elicited in para-5 of the cross-examination of MW.1, wherein he has admitted that, the ledger maintenance is given to Junior Assistant and Senior Assistant, and that there is no minimum qualification is fixed at the time of granting approval. He has further admitted that, except third claimant -Ravindranath, other claimants are more qualified. He pleaded his ignorance when it is suggested to him that, the first party claimants were engaged by the corporation for more than 9 to 13 years.

15. If we come to the evidence of MW.2 in his chief-examination has reiterated the entire objection statement jointly filed on behalf of respondents no.3 to 7. In his cross-examination, he has admitted that, the minimum qualification of appointment as Junior Assistant is 10<sup>th</sup> pass. He has further admitted that, the Junior Assistant do clerk job and will be posted to do clerical work in the various section of their department including ledger maintenance. He pleaded ignorance when it was suggested to him that, some of the similarly placed employees have been regularized pursuant to the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. The first party claimants have worked under the Executive Engineer of Bidar Division upto 2008 is admitted. However, he has denied that from January 2008 they were terminated from work on the assurance that their services will be regularized in a phased manner. From these documentary evidence it is clear that, the services of first party claimants was taken by the corporation to the particular post, obviously to do particular work in different sections. The learned counsel for the first party claimants has relied upon the decision rendered by the Hon'ble **High Court of Karnataka, Kalaburagi Bench, Kalaburagi, in WP Nos. 1001460 -101467/2013 (L-RES) rendered by the Hon'ble Justice A.S. Bopanna, on 15-12-2005**, by this writ petition eight first party claimants working as Junior Assistant ledger maintenance in the corporation of respondents had raised the dispute and their dispute was referred to

Labour Court, Kalaburagi, in Ref. No.12/2012 and Labour Court had rejected their claim. They had again filed writ petition and Hon'ble High Court allowed the writ petition. In the said case also those writ petitioners had worked upto 2008. It is pertinent to note that, in Ex.W8 while submitting the details of the first party claimants who were then working along with others even their other details as such caste, qualification and from which period they have been working have been given. All these first party claimants have been working from 27-07-1999 i.e. from the date of such period to that of successful writ petitioners in the above referred decision were working. In the present case also there is no order of termination of the workmen and it was only oral order of the respondents that they were prevented from working. It is evident that, for one time taking bond has been taken, thereafter no subsequent bond have been taken after completion of one year contract period and they have been continuously worked from 1998 to 2008 more than 10 years. It is not that after the completion of the period of their first engagement and they giving undertaking Rs.100/- stamp paper had come to an end. His lordships in the above referred decision para-7 on page-8 has held that, "*the work is of continuous nature but the tenure of the workmen was being continued from time to time with artificial break which in fact amounts to unfair labour practice.*"

16. It has been specifically pleaded by the first party workmen the matter in WP Nos.101460 – 101467/2013 (L-RES) was challenged by the respondents no.3 by way of writ appeal, the Writ Appeal No.200007 -200010 of 2016 (L-RES) and Writ Appeal Nos.200140 – 200143/2016, the said appeals came to be dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Kalaburagi Bench, Kalaburagi, dated 13-07-2016. After the dismissal of writ appeals it was again taken up to the Hon'ble Apex Court by way of Special Leave Petition in Civil No.26192 – 26199/ 2016 that which came to be dismissed. Therefore,

when admittedly, similarly placed employees have been regularized, these first party claimants ought not to have been singled out. The respondents ought to have responded to the representation given by these first party claimants. On the contrary, they started contesting the matter. Therefore, it cannot be said that the approach of the first party claimants is a speculative litigation. On the contrary, they are seeking their legitimate right. Therefore, I have no hesitation to answer **Issue No.1 and Additional Issue No.1 in negative.**

17. **ISSUE NO.2:** In view of my finding on the above issues, the reference petition filed by the first party claimants is deserves to be allowed. Hence, I proceed to pass the following;

#### ORDER

- i) Reference No.10(1)(c)/2/2019 (old Reference No.10(1)(c)/1/2018) filed by the 1<sup>st</sup> party claimants/workman under **Section 10(1)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act,1947** is hereby **allowed**.
- ii) It is hereby held that, the respondents are not justified in not regularizing the first party claimants/workmen, therefore, respondents are directed to continue the service of the first party claimants/workmen by reinstating them into service to the post they held with all consequential benefits with continuity of service, **within four weeks** from the date of publication of the award.
- iv) Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties are directed to bear their own costs.

v) The office is directed to send a copy of the award to the Government for its publication as provided U/Sec.17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(The judgment is dictated to the Judgment writer, transcribed and computerized by him, corrected by me, and then pronounced in the open Court on this **7<sup>th</sup> day of April 2021**)

(Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

### **ANNEXURES**

#### **LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED BY THE CLAIMANT:**

WW.1      Sharnappa S/o Nagshetty, Jr. Assistant.

#### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED BY THE CLAIMANT**

Ex.W1.      KEB proceedings dated 09-09-1998.

Ex.W2.      Letter dated 21-07-2007.

Ex.W3.      Letter dated 16-01-2008.

Ex.W4 to 7. Official memorandums.

Ex.W.8.      Particular list dated 1-11-2008.

Ex.W.9 & 10. Particular of the claimants dated 31-07-2008.

Ex.W11.      Engagement of contract workers.

Ex.W.12      Engagement of contract basis.

Ex.W.13.      Certificate.

Ex.W.14.      Letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> August.

Ex.W.15.      KEB proceedings.

Ex.W.16.      KEB order dated 21-01-2016.

#### **LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED BY THE RESPONDENTS:**

MW.1      T.N. Chandrashekahr, Manger.

MW.2.      Basavaraj Patil S/o Apaprao Patil, E.E.

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED BY RESPONDENTS:**

- Ex.M1. Circular dated 20-02-2003.
- Ex.M2. Attested copy of office memorandum.
- Ex.M3 to 7. Payment of wages ledger extract.

(Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya),  
Principal Dist. & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

SMH\*\*

**PR-257**

THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,  
AT BIDAR.

**DATED: THIS THE 3<sup>rd</sup> DAY OF MARCH 2021**

**PRESENT;**

Sri Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya.  
M.Sc.LL.B (Spl.)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

**REFERENCE NO.2A2/3/2019**  
**(Old Reference No.2A2/11/2019)**

**CLAIMANT:**

Mohd. Sofiyan S/o Mohd. Munvar Ali, age 33 years,  
occupation: nil Ex-driver No.1670 NEKRTC, Bidar,r/o  
Hudagi- 457800, Tq. Humnabad, Dist. Bidar.

**(By Sri Ashok B. Noola, Advocate )**

-VERSUS-

**RESPONDENTS:**

1. The Managing Director, NEKRTC Central Office, Sarige Sadan, main road, Kalaburagi.
2. The Divisional Controller, NEKRTC, Bidar Division, Bidar.

**(R1 Ex parte  
R2 by G.B. Hiregouda, Adv.)**

## **JUDGMENT**

1. This a reference **U/Sec. 2A2 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947** filed by the first party/workman challenging the order of termination passed by the second party/respondents vide its order No. NEKT/BDR/ABST/487/2014/1174/2016-17 dated 06-08-2016 and to order of reinstatement into service of the first party/workman and to include his name in the list of job trainee driver with continuity of service and all consequential benefits, in the interest of justice.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, the first party/workman has filed this petition U/Sec.2A2 of ID Act, 1947 challenging his termination order passed by the second party/respondents averring that, he was appointed under the respondents no.1 and 2 as a driver as per Notification No.1/2011 dated 25-08-2011 in a NEKRTC against the permanent post, as per law, after conducting all the test. It is his case that, ever since his date of appointment, he worked sincerely, honestly to the full satisfaction of the management until he was illegally terminated from his service on 06-08-2016. After the appointment, he was sent to training center for training for one or two days, thereafter he was assigned regular work by deputing him to Bidar Division, Humnabad Depot and was sent on duty as regular without any break equivalent to that of regular employees including long route. Therefore, the work turn down by the first party/workman is similar to the work of regular employees, but he was paid less and no incentive was given to him. The second party in order to avoid the statutory provision available under the law and also to pay the less wages, named the post as trainee and had put some illegal conditions which are against the principles of natural justice, hence are not binding upon the first party/workman. At the time of deputing him to the duty at Humnabad Depot, he was placed as a trainee for a period of two years, which was completed on 18-02-2016 and the said period neither was extended nor any fresh order was given after completion of said period.

2.1) That on 19-09-2014 the respondent has issued a show cause notice that the first party/workman remained unauthorized absent from his duty from 04-03-2014 to 23-09-2014, which was replied by the first party/workman, thereafter without issuing any intimation, disciplinary authority has appointed the enquiry officer, enquiry officer has conducted the enquiry issuing enquiry notice to the first party/workman and that he was attended on 23-12-2014, on which date plea was recorded without same being read over to him and his signature was taken. It is submitted that, thereafter the matter was posted on 09-07-2015 on which the enquiry officer recorded reporter statement and not given time to cross-examine the reporter, and the enquiry officer himself cross-examined reporter on behalf of workman/first party, without workman's consent. It is alleged that, both days proceedings copy was not furnished to the workman/first party and without giving reasonable opportunity to defend his case and termination order was passed.

2.2) According to him, while giving reply to the show cause notice, he had made it clear that, he was suffering from ailments during the period of his absence and had taken treatment in various hospital and that he had gone on leave with due permission of the Depot Manager. Therefore, his absence was not unauthorized absence. He has also submitted the prescriptions, medical bills and fitness certificate before the second party/respondents along with joining report to the Depot Manager and Depot Manager in turn referred it to the first party/workman to the second party/ respondents seeking permission for allowing duty to the first party. Though the second party gave the permission to report duty, later on, he was terminated under this impugned order. Therefore, according to the first party/workman the order of termination is illegal, perverse, false and highly opposed the principles of natural justice, since show cause notice issued to him was not in accordance with principles of natural justice. No relevant documents were

furnished along with show cause notice, his explanation was not taken into consideration. Therefore, the enquiry conducted by the second party management is not in accordance with principles of natural justice. He has also taken other contention of which he assailing the impugned order.

2.3) The first party/workman has also pleaded that, disciplinary authority has not given into consideration the socio economic status of the first party/workman before passing the impugned order of removal, since the entire family is depending upon the earnings of the first party/workman and now by virtue of this impugned order of termination and force unemployment as thrown the entire family to the street of the first party/workman. It is further contended that, without admitting the guilt, the workman submits that, the order of termination is shockingly disproportionate to gravity of misconduct. Though he was appointed as a driver for a period of two years posting as trainee, but despite he completed that two years, he was not regularized and was removed from service illegally. Therefore, the termination is illegal, unjus and unwarranted. The order of termination is by way of unfair labour practice and victimization and by way of colourable exercise of the powers.

2.4) It is submitted that, respondent has committed mistake by considering the first party/workman as only trainee though after completion of the period only he was sent on regular duty by deputing him to Humnabad Depot. The first party/workman had completed more than four years of service as on the date of removal from service. The respondent to avoid granting of regular pay scale. The respondent's official are considering the workers as a trainee. The law is well settled that keeping a workman as trainee or badali for years together is nothing short of unfair labour practice. The work discharged by the first party/workman is of permanent in nature, as such, the very issuance of show cause notice under the C & R is fatal and action taken upon the such vague show cause notice is required to be set aside.

3. In response to service of notice, 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has remained absent, and has been placed ex parte, whereas 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent has appeared through learned standing counsel and has filed his counter statement, in its counter statement it is pleaded that, the first party/workman was a trainee driver with Batch No.1670 attached to Bidar Depot and had remained unauthorized absent from 04-03-2014 to 23-09-2014 i.e. 202 days without permission and without applying for leave and sanction of leave, thereby causing inconvenience to the corporation and causing revenue loss to the corporation. Hence, the Depot Manager, Bidar, submitted report in this regard for taking further action, based on which, show cause notice dated 23-09-2014 was issued to the first party/workman and first party has not replied to the said show cause notice. However, in order to find out the truth, the departmental enquiry was ordered by appointing Administrative Officer, Bidar Division, as an enquiry officer, and enquiry authority has conducted the enquiry as per C & R regulation in accordance with principles of natural justice and giving sufficient opportunity to the first party/workman. The enquiry authority has furnished the enquiry notices to the first party/ workman on several time and in his presence only the reporter has been examined and first party/workman has cross-examined the reporter. On the same day, the enquiry was concluded with the consent of the first party/workman and copy of the proceedings were furnished to the first party/workman and later on time was granted to him to submit defence statement, for which, he did not submit his defence statement. Thereafter, disciplinary authority after perusing the entire records of the case, came to the conclusion that, the first party/workman guilty of the charges and held that, he has remained absence unauthorised thereby violated the new regulations resulting inconvenience to the public and revenue loss to the corporation. Hence, opined that, continuation of his service is detrimental to the interest of corporation, therefore, the impugned order of removing the

first party/workman from service is just and proportionate to the gravity of the offence. This first party/workman was involved in five cases of absenteeism and was awarded minor punishment with the hope that he would reform. But he has failed to any improvement in his conduct. Therefore, in view of the admission of the first party/workman of unauthorized absent and he was a trainee driver is required to complete the training period satisfactorily, but has failed to do so. Hence, he is liable for the punishment.

4. Based on the pleadings of the parties, while matter was pending before the District Judge & Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Kalaburagi, the following four issues have been framed on 30-03-2019;

### **ISSUES**

- 1) Whether the enquiry conducted by the second party/ respondents is fair and proper?
- 2) Whether misconduct of the first party/ claimant is proved?
- 3) Whether the second party/ respondents are right in dismissing the first party/claimant from service vide its order NEKT/ BDR/ABST/487/ 2014/1174/2016-17 dated 06-08-2016?
- 4) What order/ Award?

After issue no.1 has been treated as preliminary issue, and then the Presiding Officer after recording the evidence of management/ second party held issue no.1 in negative, thereafter the matter was posted for evidence on other issues, in the meanwhile the matter was transferred to this Court.

5. The first party/workman got himself examined as WW.1 got marked Ex.W.1 and Ex.W2. The second party witness has been examined himself as MW1 and got marked Ex.M1 to Ex.M11 and closed their side.

6. The learned counsel for the respondents/second party submitted that, the evidence adduced on issue no.1 holds good for other issues as well.

7. I have heard the arguments on both sides and same is now posted for judgment.

8. My findings to the above issues are as under:

**Issue No.2: In affirmative,**

**Issue No.3: In negative,**

**Issue No.4: As per final order,** for the following;

**REASONS**

9. **ISSUE NO.2 & 3:** These issues are taken up together for discussion, as they are inter related to one another and the evidence adduced by both parties are over lapping on these issues.

10. The main contentions of the respondents is that, the first party/workman was appointed as a trainee driver with Batch No. 1670 and as per his records he was deputed as trainee driver. Ex.M.13 under reference no.2, there is mention about the order dated 06-03-2012 under which first party/workman was appointed. MW.2 Devarajgouda, has deposed in his cross-examination that, workman was working in Humnabad Depot as a driver. He has also deposed that, after the appointment workers are permanent and after undergoing two years training and thereafter again they will be under probation for a period of two years and during that period, if their work is satisfactory, they will be made permanent employees. He has also admitted that, this first party/ workman was appointed as a driver, in the year 2011, and further admitted that, during first two years of training schedule, if the work of the workman is not satisfactorily, his training period will be extended upto six months. He has further admitted that, this first party/workman joined for duty on 18-02-2012 and he pleaded his ignorance, when it was suggested to him that, for first two years i.e. upto 18-02-2014 his service was satisfactory. He has also admitted that, during this training schedule also the workman/first party would be given the same work as that of the

permanent employees and assigned his work on long routes driving etc. He has further contended that, till issuance of Ex.M.9 dated 19-09-2014, he had not given any report against this workman to the management. No doubt, this witness has explained that it is only in the month of August of that year 2014, he had come to that depot. Even then, if say of the management is to be believed that, he was regularly irregular and had remained unauthorized absent, then those absentee period must have been recorded and they should have been reported by the earlier Depot Manager who was working earlier to this MW.2. He has also pleaded his ignorance when it was suggested to him that this first party/workman was suffering from decease, has submitted medical report and sought the permission of the then Depot Manager, for that he has no explanation.

11. Now admittedly, when this matter was pending on the file of Labour Court, Kalaburagi, issue no.1 has been answered in negative against the management to say that, the enquiry conducted was not proper and it has been specifically observed by the Presiding Officer of Labour Court, it has been hurriedly done. This MW.2 further admitted that, his predecessor Depot Manager, if really, his workman as remained unauthorized absent, then he should have reported the matter to the management. It is also suggested to him that, this workman had even given application along with medical report to the previous Depot Manager and had taken his permission, therefore, claims that he was not unauthorized absent. If admittedly, the records pertaining to the employee are with the management, it is for them to produce those records and prove that the absence was unauthorized. He has also admitted that, by taking into consideration the medical report furnished by the workman, he was permitted to join for duties. He has also admitted that Ex.M10 has been prepared by him and produced in the Court. On this Ex.M10, he has nowhere mentioned that, it is the extract of the muster role maintained by the management, that is only entries have been

---

made by this witness to substantiate to their show cause notice given to the first party/workman. MW.2 has also further admitted that, he was unaware of this Ex.M13 the termination order passed by the management. His evidence is clear reflection of the facts that how the management works without adhering principles of natural justice.

12. Per contra, if we look at the evidence of workman/first party, he has deposed that, he was ailing, as he was suffering from kidney stones. He has also admitted to the fact that, he was absent from 04-03-2014 to 23-09-2014. But however, he has denied that he was absent unauthorizedly. The main contention of the second party management and as concluded in Ex.M13 the final order of termination. The conduct of this workman has caused great inconvenience in the daily running of the schedule causing inconvenience to the public and loss of revenue to the corporation. In order to demonstrate that the punishment imposed was proportionate to so-called misconduct of person, the corporation has not produced any material evidence to which particular route this workman was assigned his duty, what was the regular collection when he was on duty, whether that schedule was totally cancelled and due to his absence how much was the monetary loss caused to the corporation.

13. The first party/workman during his evidence has produced medical certificate which shows that, he was suffering from enteric fever/typhoid from 08-04-2014 to 09-06-2014. But in his evidence during course of cross-examination deposed that, he was suffering from kidney stone. Therefore, this is contrary to his pleading regarding his absence. At any rate, while appreciating the evidence of MW.2, it is stated that, he did not report about absence of this workman during that period and he is unaware as to whether his predecessor in office had reported or not. What it goes to show that, there appears to hand in glow arrangement between workman/first party and Depot Manager to remain absent at their convenience if they have got any personal work, the workman keep absent himself from

the work not bothering about institution for which he is working and forgetting he has been given an employment no doubt as a trainee driver. Therefore, in my considered view that, the respondents/corporation is able to prove that there is a misconduct on the part of the first party/workman. But question is whether this misconduct is so much to the effect that, he was to be terminated. I am of the considered view that, the punishment of termination of service itself is disproportionate the proved misconduct on the part of the first party/workman. It is worth to be mentioned here based on the medical report submitted by this first party/workman same has been accepted, he was allowed to resume for duties. Therefore, at the best his training schedule should have been extended for six months, depending upon his performance. But certainly this was not a case to terminate him from the service itself. In this behalf, the learned counsel for the workman/first party has relied upon Division Bench of our own Hon'ble High Court in **Writ Appeal No.200279/2017 (L-KSRTC) order dated 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 between Chanabasappa Vs. The Divisional Controller, NEKRTC, Raichur Division, Raichur**, wherein it has been observed that, “*if the termination was not because of any misconduct involving moral turpitude and was only due to the unauthorized absence then if an opportunity of performing to the satisfaction of the respondent is granted without treating the opportunity as a reinstatement or involving any financial benefit in that regard, the ends of justice would be met*”. Accordingly, judgment of the Hon'ble High Court modified the award of the Labour Court directing the “*corporation/respondent to place the workman as a newly appointed trainee without any previous rights and if in the said process the appellant completes the training period satisfactorily henceforth, he may be considered for regular appointment*”. In the present case also almost it fits under the same category because in the relief claimed by the first party/workman is to the effect that to set aside the termination

---

order, order for reinstatement into service to include his name in the list of job trainee driver with continuity of service and all consequential benefits.

14. When admittedly, this workman was not an employee in a strict sense, but he has been regularly used by allowing the schedule event to the long route also which is not disputed, therefore, until he complete the training schedule question of his continuity of service and all consequential benefits that he has claimed do not arise, that which has to be negatived. But however, he has to be included in the list of job trainee driver deserves to be accepted by setting aside the termination order. Hence, I answer **issue no.2 in affirmative** and **issue no.3 in negative**.

15. **ISSUE NO.4:** In view of my finding on the above issues, it is a fit case to invoke discretion conferred on this Court U/Sec.11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to order for reinstatement of the first party/claimant with continuity of service as a trainee driver, but without back wages. Accordingly, it is held that, the first party/ claimant is entitled for order of reinstatement by setting aside the order of dismissal. Hence, I proceed to pass the following;

**ORDER**

- i) Reference No.2A2/3/2019 (old Reference No. 2A2/11/2019) filed by the claimant/workman under **Section 2A2 of Industrial Disputes Act,1947** is hereby allowed in part.
- ii) The order passed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in File No. NEKT/BDR/ABST/487./2014/1174/2016-17 dated 06-08-2016 is hereby set aside.
- iii) The respondents are directed to reinstate the first party/workman—**Mohd. Sofiyaan S/o Mohd Munawar Ali**, as trainee driver, without any back wages and on completion of the training period satisfactorily he may be consider for regular appointment, **within four weeks** from the date of publication of the award.

- 
- iv) Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties are directed to bear their own costs.
- v) The office is directed to send a copy of the award to the Government for its publication as provided U/Sec.17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(The judgment is dictated to the Judgment writer, transcribed and computerized by him, corrected by me, and then pronounced in the open Court on this **3<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2021**)

(Kadloor Satyanarayananacharya)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

### **ANNEXURES**

#### **LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED BY THE CLAIMANT:**

WW.1      Mohd. Sofiyan S/o Mohd. Munvar Ali.

#### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED BY THE CLAIMANT**

Ex.W1.      Medical certificate.

Ex.W2.      Medical Certificate.

#### **LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED BY THE RESPONDENTS:**

MW.1      Mahadevappa S/o Nagashetty Uppin, A.O.

MW.2.      Devarajouda S/o Kappannagouda, Depot Manager.

#### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED BY RESPONDENTS:**

Ex.M1.      Order of appointment dated 19-11-2014

Ex.M2.      Enquiry notice dated 17-12-2014

Ex.M3.      Enquiry notice dated 15-10-2015.

Ex.M4.      Speed post acknowledgement.

Ex.M5.      Statement of reporter.

Ex.M6.      Proceedings.

Ex.M7.      Order sheet.

- Ex.M8. Dismissal order.
- Ex.M9. Absent report.
- Ex.M10. Unauthorized absent attendance.
- Ex.M11. Unauthorized absent report.
- Ex.M12. Show cause notice.
- Ex.M13. Termination order.

(Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya),  
Principal Dist. & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

SMH\*\*

**PR-258**

**THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,  
AT BIDAR.**

**DATED: THIS THE 8<sup>th</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY 2021**

**PRESENT:**

Sri Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya.  
M.Sc.LL.B (Spl.)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

**REFERENCE NO.2A2-4/2019**  
**(Old Reference No.2A2-1/2019)**

**CLAIMANT:**

Ashok S/o Manohar Rathod, age 38 years, occupation:  
Driver No.1690, Bidar- I Depot, R/o at post Kaghod,Tq.  
Vijaypur, Dist. Vijaypur.

**(By Sri B. R. Patil, Advocate )**

-VERSUS-

**RESPONDENTS:**

1. The Managing Director, NEKRTC Central Office, Kalaburagi.
2. The Divisional Controller, NEKRTC, Bidar Division, Bidar.

**(R1 Ex parte  
R2 by G.B. Hiregouda, Adv.)**

**ORDER**

1. The claimant/workman has filed his claim petition **U/Sec. 2A2 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947** against the order of dismissal dated 29-05-2018 passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, first party/claimant was appointed as driver under respondents no.1 and 2 and that since the date of his appointment, he was rendering his duty sincerely, honestly and to the full satisfaction of the management until he was illegally dismissed from the service. It is pleaded that, in the month of December 2016, first party workman was not feeling well and was not in a position of doing duty as driver, as such had applied for leave on 18-12-2016 to the Depot Manager, and had gone for one week leave. It is further pleaded that, after treatment he was advised to take bed rest, as such he gave leave application requesting the Depot Manager to sanction leave for one more month as he was suffering from jaundice and thus went on leave with due permission of the Depot Manager, thereafter, he could not recover soon and thereafter again he sought for extension of leave period and after recovering from ill health, he came to Depot on 17-05-2017 for resuming his duty, but the Depot Manager refused to give him duty and asked to get permission from respondent office, therefore, he approached 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent to accord permission to resume for duty and 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in turn after verifying the documents, 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent was pleased to give duty and by the same time he was surprised to receive charge-sheet dated 03-04-2017. It is further case of the first party workman that, he gave reply to the charge-sheet by denying charges and thereafter enquiry was conducted and finally the workman was dismissed from service.

3. According to 1<sup>st</sup> party workman, order of dismissal is illegal and void ab initio. That the reporter has made false report against the workman with a malafide intention of

harassing and to spoil his service record. That the charge-sheet that has been issued is not in accordance with principle of natural justice, since more relevant documents were not furnished to the workman. The enquiry which has been conducted is against the principle of natural justice and C & D regulations and same was conducted without issuing notice to workman, as such, he could not attend the enquiry. It is his contention that, the enquiry officer had not given reasonable and adequate opportunity of hearing to defend his case. On 29-09-2017 the date fixed for preliminary enquiry, the first party/claimant had appeared and had denied the charges and claimed for enquiry, thereafter the matter was posted for evidence of reporter. On 17-10-2017 the evidence of reporter was recorded, thereafter case was posted for cross-examination on 30-10-2017. On 30-10-2017 the reporter was cross-examined, thereafter the first party/claimant had requested time for leading defence evidence, but enquiry officer without giving time, closed the enquiry and on the same day gave one sided findings holding the workman guilty of charges. Therefore, it is contended that, the findings of enquiry officer are illegal, perverse and against law and it is nothing but victimization and unfair labour practice. Since the workman went on leave with due permission, there was no cancellation of schedules or loss caused to the corporation. That the respondent had taken into consideration some earlier cases while passing the order of dismissal which are not part of the charge-sheet or proved in the enquiry. Therefore, the respondent was prejudiced against the workman is evident. Hence, prayed to allow the petition and set aside the order passed by the respondent vide its order NEKRTC: BDR: ABSM: 113/ 17/768/18-19 dated 29-05-2018 and to order for reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages in the interest of justice and equity.

4. In response to service of notice, 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has remained absent, and has been placed ex parte, whereas 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent has appeared through learned standing counsel.

Earlier this case was pending on the file of Labour Court at Kalaburagi and counter was filed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in his counter statement while admitting the fact that, the first party claimant was serving as driver, bearing Batch No.1690 attached to Bidar Depot-I, contended that, he remained unauthorized absent from 18-12-2016 to 19-05-2017 (total 152 days) without permission and without applying and sanction of leave, thereby caused inconvenience in daily running of the buses resulting in revenue loss to the corporation and inconvenience to the travelling public. Therefore, the Depot Manager, Bidar Depot-I had submitted the report in this regard, against the first party, based on which, articles of charges dated 03-04-2017 and revised articles of charges dated 19-05-2017 were issued to the first party and who has replied it and denied the same.

4.1) It is further contended that, in order to find out the truth of the case, departmental enquiry was ordered by appointing Sri S.N. Patil, retired Public Prosecutor, as enquiry authority, who conducted the enquiry as per C & D regulations with principle of natural justice giving sufficient opportunity to the first party and adhering to the stage wise as proceedings of recording the evidence of report, furnishing the copy of proceedings to the first party, matter was posted for defence evidence of first party. But he did not choose to reply to the same. Therefore, ultimately, the enquiry authority has passed the final order holding first party guilty and passed this order under challenge. It is contended that, the enquiry officer has conducted enquiry in fair and impartial and in accordance with C & D regulations giving full opportunity to the first party to defend his case, but inspite of that, he was not availed that opportunity and negligent in his duty being chronic defaulter, thereby caused great inconvenience in the daily running schedules causing loss of revenue to the corporation, hence, continuation of his service is detrimental to the interest of corporation, as such, dismissal of 1<sup>st</sup> part from the service is just and proportionate to the gravity of offence and thus prayed for dismissal of the claim petition.

4.2) It is further contended that, the respondent has filed application under Section 33(2)(B) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 before the Tribunal at Bengaluru and one month wages of Rs.19,779/- has been paid to the first party claimant on 29-05-2018 by way of cheque. Therefore, there is compliance of Section 33(2)(B) of ID Act, 1947. Therefore, it is prayed that, in case the Court holds that, the Departmental Enquiry is illegal, then the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent permitted to lead evidence regarding misconduct of the first party.

5. Based on the pleadings of the parties, while matter was pending before the District Judge & Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Kalaburagi, the following four issues have been framed on 22-03-2019;

### **ISSUES**

- 1) Whether the enquiry conducted by the second party/ respondents is fair and proper?
- 2) Whether misconduct of the first party/ claimant is proved?
- 3) Whether the second party/ respondents are right in dismissing the first party/claimant from service vide its order NEKRTC: BDR: ABSM: 113/17/768/18-19 dated 29-05-2018?
- 4) What order/ Award?

Issue no.1 has been treated as preliminary issue. The first party got himself examined as WW.1 and 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent has not entered the witness box.

6. The Labour Court, Kalaburagi, has passed order on issue no.1 by order dated 15-04-2019 holding that, the issue no.1 in negative, meaning thereby inquiry conducted by second party was not fair and proper. Thereafter matter was stood posted for evidence on other issues on behalf of second party. The second party witness has been examined as MW.1 and Ex.M.1 to Ex.M.9 have been got marked. Thereafter, first party has adduced his evidence on other issues as Dw.1 on 28-06-2019 when this matter was still pending on the

---

file of Labour Court, Kalaburagi. Thereafter, in view of the judgment in WP No.6242/2015 dated 21-07-2015 and letter of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Bengaluru, vide RSB No.245 of 2019 dated 11-07-2019 and GO No. LAW 164 LCE 2014 dated 22-01-2015, the records were transmitted to this Court.

7. On receipt of the records, notices were issued to both sides, Sri B. R. Patil, for claimant appeared, whereas Sri G.B. Hiregouda appeared for 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and matter was posted for arguments, in the mean time, in view of the closure of Courts on account of Covid-19 Pandemic, the case could not be taken up for hearing as respective Advocates are coming from Kalaburagi did not appear before the Court and took up case finally on 23-01-2021 for arguments and both counsels appeared and submitted their arguments and same is now posted for order.

8. My findings to the above issues are as under:

**Issue No.2: In affirmative,**

**Issue No.3: In negative,**

**Issue No.4: As per final order,** for the following:

#### REASONS

9. **ISSUE NO.2 & 3:** In view of the fact that, the issue no.1 which was treated as preliminary issue and that evidence having been led by both sides, the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Kalaburagi, has answered issue no.1 in negative when this matter was pending on the file of Labour Court, Kalaburagi, by order dated 15-04-2019. Admittedly, this issue has not been challenged by the respondents, therefore, now it is to be seen as to whether there was a misconduct on the part of the first party claimant in remaining absent for his duties or that he was incapacitated on account of his ill health as pleaded by him and that in the event of respondents proving the misconduct on the part of the first party

workman the question would be whether punishment given his proportionate to the so-called misconduct. According to the first party/claimant, in December 2016 he was not feeling well, thus was not in a position to attend to his duty as driver, therefore, he had given application on 18-12-2016 to the Depot Manager and went on leave for one week, since he was suffering from jaundice and after taking one week treatment, he was advised to take one month bed-rest, therefore, he gave another application requesting the Depot Manager to sanction leave for one month and went on leave with the permission of the Depot Manager, but however, he could not recover even during that leave period, therefore, he had sent leave extension application periodically and after recovering from the ill health, finally on 17-05-2017 he came to Depot assuming for duty, but was not allowed to report to duty and asked to get the permission from the respondents office, therefore, he approached Division Office 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent to accord permission and 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent after verifying the documents, allowed him to report for duty, at the same time charge-sheet was given to him.

10. There is no denial about the fact that this first party/claimant remained absent for 152 days. But his contention is that, on account of suffering jaundice, he had gone on leave with permission of the Depot Manager. The contention of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is otherwise that, the first party claimant is habitual in remaining absence from duty unauthorizely and even for the earlier seven occasion, he had remained absent likewise, therefore, he was imposed fine on holding enquiry etc; and because of the past history of the claimant first party, they had to take this extreme step of dismissing him from service after holding due enquiry.

11. WW.1 in his evidence on oath has categorically deposed regarding the reason for his absence for 152 days, as he was suffering from jaundice. He has also categorically deposed

that, he had informed the Depot Manager about his inability and had also given the leave application, therefore, the suggestion made to him in the cross-examination that, he had remained unauthorized absent, has been denied by this witness, reiterating the fact that, he had given the leave application. It is known fact that, for jaundice disease alopethic treatment is not effective and generally in part of this District of Northern Karnataka, the patient suffering from jaundice invariably depending upon the Aryurvedic treatment. To rebut the contention of this first party/claimant that, he had given leave application to the Depot Manager, the reporter officer has not been examined in this case. MW.1 who is examined in this case by name one K. L. Chandrashekhar, new Depot Manager, but in the opening sentence of chief-examination itself he has made it clear that, the actual Depot Manager who had reported this case of absence of first party/claimant, is on suspension and in his place he has come forward to depose, obviously he has no personal knowledge about what had transpired between first party/claimant and then Depot Manager who was then working, who has stated to have been suspended.

12. It is not the case of the respondent that, the suspended official is not available for bringing before the Court or that his whereabouts are not known. Suspended official cannot leave the headquarters from the place where he was last working. Therefore, the best person to rebut the contention of first party claimant, would have been that the official who was then working as Depot Manager during the period between 18-12-2016 to 19-05-2017. Therefore, the evidence adduced by the respondent to rebut the contention of first party/claimant is of no consequence. Even otherwise, it goes to show that, MW.1 has deposed based on the record that have been subsequently brought up from the date of issuance of charge-sheet. It is pertinent to note that, the first charge-sheet was issued on 03-04-2017 and thereafter revise charge-sheet is served on 19-05-2017 and next within ten

---

days, the entire matter has been closed in passing final order of dismissal. This itself is clear demonstration of vindictiveness on the part of the respondent in dealing with its employee workman. This MW.1 has admitted in the cross-examination that, Depot Manager is required to report the Divisional Controller immediately with regard to an employee remaining absent for more than seven days. He has also admitted that, except Ex.M1 & Ex.M2 dated 27-02-2017 and 27-05-2017 the then Depot Manager has not given any other report with regard to first party/claimant absence from work. Had really the first party/ claimant not given any leave application to the Depot Manager, definitely the Depot Manager would not have kept quite and would have reported the Divisional Controller immediately after 7 days of absence. It is further pertinent to note that, as per the office procedure of the respondent, as admitted in the cross-examination in para-4 by MW.1, even for unauthorized absentee the call letters it would be sent by the Divisional Office to the employee and the records produced do not contain any such call letters. From this statement two factors emerges out, one is that, initial absence of the employee was definitely not unauthorized, therefore, no report was submitted by the Depot Manager. For that reason, Divisional Office had no chance to issue any call letters.

13. This itself goes to show that, it was all because of communication gap between first party/claimant and the Depot Manager and Depot Manager with his higher officer which is rather reflecting upon the laxity on the part of both first party claimant and the Depot Manager on one side and exposing non-cordiality between the employee and the management, in between Depot Manager happens to be a link. This would have been avoided was Depot Manager was diligent enough to bring it notice of the respondent, if really, the absence of claimant/first party was unauthorized.

14. The charge memo Ex.M.6 made mention about the earlier seven time, this claimant/first party having been remained absent unauthorizedly and indicated with deduction of proportionate deduction in his salary depending upon the number of days he had remained absent. But those seven time absence having been suitably punished by awarding punishment in the form of fine deducting in the salary can be equated for absence due to ailment. It is not the case of the respondent that, the loss occasioned to the corporation was higher than the fine amount awarded as against him or that there were no leave to his credit so as to adjust 152 days absence as against the leave in his credit. Even in the present case also the corporation has not produced material evidence as to how many routes got cancelled on account of absence of this first party claimant resulting in financial loss to the corporation. At least, it has not produced what was the route collection of this first party claimant route to quantify the said loss so as to say that, the loss cannot be equated in terms of money value by awarding any fine against the first party claimant, and that dismissal itself would be ultimate lesson to the first party/claimant. Therefore, in my considered view that, punishment in the form of dismissal in a given case at hand is certainly disproportionate to the so-called wrong committed by the first party/claimant. This conclusion is arrived since it has been the definite case of the first party, he had submitted leave application to the Depot Manager and went on seeking extension of the leave period on account of his ailment and that the Depot Manager has not been examined to rebut the contention of the first party/claimant. Therefore, this absence cannot be considered as case involving moral turpitude on the part of the first party/claimant so as to order for dismissal by the respondents. Therefore, the order of dismissal is liable to the set aside, as it is disproportionate to proved misconduct.

15. It is pertinent to note that, the first party/claimant has not retained the copy of the leave application submitted by him during this period of absence, this also shows casualness on his part. The staff arrangement to the corporation is definitely a big headache and the Court can definitely take judicial notice to this fact, since we generally see commuters waiting for the bus hours together in the bus stand. Therefore, there is an element of misconduct on the part of the claimant first party also in the form of total negligence in not ascertaining as to whether his earlier leave application has been sanctioned or not. Therefore, to put such employees on guard, the employee has to suffer the ordeal of loss of back wages for the absentee period while ordering for reinstatement. Hence, I answer **issue no.2 in affirmative and issue no.3 in negative.**

16. **ISSUE NO.4:** In view of my finding on the above issues, it is a fit case to invoke discretion conferred on this Court U/Sec.11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to order for reinstatement of the first party/claimant with continuity of serviced and all consequential benefits , but without back wages. Accordingly, the issue no.4 hold that, the first party/claimant is entitled for order of reinstatement by setting aside the order of dismissal. Hence, I proceed to pass the following;

#### ORDER

- i) Reference No.2A2/4/2019 (old Reference No.1/2019) filed by the claimant/workman under **Section 2A2 of Industrial Disputes Act,1947** is hereby allowed in part.
- ii) The order passed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in File No. NEKRTC: BDR: ABSM: 113/ 17/768/18-19 dated 29-05-2018 is hereby set aside.
- iii) The respondents are directed to reinstate the first party/claimant – Ashok S/o Manohar Rathod, continuity of service with all consequential benefits, without any back wages, **within four weeks** from the date of publication of the award.

- 
- iv) Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties are directed to bear their own costs.
  - v) The office is directed to send a copy of the award to the Government for its publication as provided U/Sec.17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(The order is dictated to the Judgment writer, transcribed and computerized by him, corrected by me, and then pronounced in the open Court on this **8<sup>th</sup> day of February 2021**)

(Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya)  
Principal District & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

### ANNEXURES

#### LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED BY THE CLAIMANT:

WW.1      Ashok S/o Manohar Rathod.

#### LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED BY THE CLAIMANT

- Nil -

#### LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED BY THE RESPONDENTS:

MW.1      K.L.Chandrashekhar S/o S. Laxmappa, Depot Manager.

#### LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED BY RESPONDENTS:

- Ex.M.1.      Report of Depot Manager dated 27-2-2017.
- Ex.M.2.      Report of depot Manager, dated 27-5-2017.
- Ex.M.3.      Attendance register extract.
- Ex.M.4.      Attendance register extract.
- Ex.M. 5.      Permission letter dated 19-05-2017.
- Ex.M.6.      charge-sheet dated 3-4-2017.
- Ex.M.7.      Revised charge-sheet dated 19-5-2017.
- Ex.M.8.      Reply to revised charge-sheet.
- Ex.M.9.      order of dismissal dated 29-05-2018.

(Kadloor Satyanarayanacharya)  
Principal Dist. & Sessions Judge,  
Bidar.

**SMH\*\***

**PR-259**

## ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ರಾಯಚೌರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ರಾಯಚೌರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಂದಾಯ/ಬುನಾವಣೆ/ಗ್ರ. ವೇ. 44/2020-21

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 09 - 04 - 2021

### ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ (ಬುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1993 ರ 12ನೇ ನಿಯಮದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾದ ಈ ಕಳೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 12-03-2021 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 2021ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಿಧ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ತೆರವಾಗಿರುವ ರಾಯಚೌರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ರಾಯಚೌರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಅತ್ಯುರು ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಗೆ ಬುನಾಯಿತ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ತುಂಬಲು ಉಪ ಬುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಬುನಾವಣೆಯ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಘೋಷಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 1993 ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣ 5 ರ ಉಪ ಪ್ರಕರಣ 8 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ (ಬುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1993ರ ನಿಯಮ 76ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಯಿಸಿ ರಾಯಚೌರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆರ್. ಹೆಚ್. ಎಂ. ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ. ಅ. ನೇ. ಅದ ನಾನು ಸದರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಅಯ್ಯಿಯಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು : ರಾಯಚೌರು

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ: ರಾಯಚೌರು

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ	ಗ್ರ. ಪಂ ಹೆಸರು	ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಸರು	ಒಟ್ಟು ಸಾಫ್ನಗಳು	ಮೀಸಲಿರಿಸಿದ ಸಾಫ್ನಗಳು	ಬುನಾಯಿತ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರು
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	ಅತ್ಯುರು	1-ಅತ್ಯುರು-1	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಹಂಪಮ್ಮೆ ನಾ   ಅತ್ಯುರು
2				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ವ್ಯಾಜನಾಧನ ನಾ   ಅತ್ಯುರು
3				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಜಯಮ್ಮೆ ನಾ   ಅತ್ಯುರು
4		2-ಅತ್ಯುರು-2	2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಬಿ. ಟಿ. ದೇವಷ್ಟ ನಾಯಕ ನಾ   ಅತ್ಯುರು
5				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಸರಸಿಂಹಲು ನಾ   ಅತ್ಯುರು
6		3-ಕಲವಲದೊಡ್ಡಿ	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಮಂಗಳನಾಯಕಿ ನಾ   ಕಲವಲದೊಡ್ಡಿ
7				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಪದ್ಮಮ್ಮೆ/ಗಿರಿಧರೆಡ್ಡಿ ನಾ   ಕಲವಲದೊಡ್ಡಿ
8				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಆಂಜಿನಯ್ಯ/ಯರಹನುಮಂತು ನಾ   ಕಲವಲದೊಡ್ಡಿ
9		4-ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್-1	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಬೃನಿ ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ ನಾ   ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್
10				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶ್ರವಂತಿ ನಾ   ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್
11				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ವೆಂಟರಾಮುಲು ನಾ   ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್
12	5-ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್-2	2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶ್ರೀದೇವೀ ನಾ   ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್	
13				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ನಾರಾಯಣ ರೆಡ್ಡಿ ನಾ   ಸಜಾಂಪೂರ್
14	6-ಕುವೆಕುದಾರ್	2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀ ನಾ   ಕುವೆಕುದಾರ್	
15				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ/ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ನಾ   ಕುವೆಕುದಾರ್

16	7-ಕುರ್ವಕಲಾ	2	ಅನುಸಂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಕುರುಮಣಿ ತಂಡ ಸಾಯಣಿ ನಾ   ಕುರ್ವಕಲಾ
17			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಬಸ್ತಿಮಣಿ ಗಂಡ ತಾಯಿಪ್ಪ ನಾ   ಕುರ್ವಕಲಾ
18	ಆತ್ಮಾರೂಪ	8-ದೊಂಗರಾಂಪೂರು-1	3	ಅನುಸಂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ
19				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ
20				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ
21		9-ದೊಂಗರಾಂಪೂರು-2	3	ಅನುಸಂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ
22				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ
23				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ

(ಆರ್.ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ಸೇ.)

ಜೀಲ್ಲಾ ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ

ಜೀಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ರಾಯಚೂರು.

**PR-260****ಜೀಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ರಾಯಚೂರು**

ನಂಖ್ಯೆ: ರಂದಾಯ/ಚುನಾವಣೆ/ಗ್ರಾ.ಫೋ/44/2020-21

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 09 - 04 -2021

**ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ**

ಕನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ರಾಜ್ (ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1993 ರ 12ನೇ ನಿಯಮದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾದ ಈ ಕಥ್ಯೇರಿಯ ಸಮಸಂಹೃದೀ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 18-08-2020 ರ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಾರ 2021ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಿಧ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ತೆರವಾಗಿರುವ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಸಿರವಾರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಬಾಗಲವಾಡ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ತುಂಬಲು ಉವ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಘೋಷಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಕನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ರಾಜ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 1993 ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣ 5 ರ ಉವ ಪ್ರಕರಣ 8 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ರಾಜ್ (ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1993ರ ನಿಯಮ 76ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜೀಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರದತ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಳಾಯಿಸಿ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜೀಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆರ್.ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ಸೇ. ಅದ ನಾನು ಸದರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಅಯ್ಯಿಯಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು : ಸಿರವಾರ

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ : ರಾಯಚೂರು

ಕ್ರ. ನಂ	ಗ್ರಾ.ಹಂ ಹೆಸರು	ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಸರು	ಒಟ್ಟು ಸಾಫ್ತನಗಳು	ಮೀನಲಿರಿಸಿದ ಸಾಫ್ತನಗಳು	ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರು
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	11-ಬಾಗಲವಾಡ	09-ಹಿರೇಬಾದರದಿನ್ನಿ	1	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ನಾಗಮಣಿ ಗಂಡ ಅಯ್ಯಣಿ

(ಆರ್.ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ಸೇ.)

ಜೀಲ್ಲಾ ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ

ಜೀಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ರಾಯಚೂರು.

**PR-261**

## ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ರಾಯಚೂರು

ನಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಂದಾಯ/ಚುನಾವಣೆ/ಗ್ರ.ಹೆ/೪೪/೨೦೨೦-೨೧

ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೦೯ - ೦೪ -೨೦೨೧

### ಪ್ರಕರಣ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ (ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು ೧೯೯೩ ರ ೧೨ನೇ ನಿಯಮದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾದ ಈ ಕಳೆಗೆ ಸಮನ್ವಯ ನಂಖ್ಯೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೮-೦೮-೨೦೨೦ ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ೨೦೨೧ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಿಧ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ತೆರವಾಗಿರುವ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಅಮೀನಗಡ, ವಟಗಲ್, ಹಾಮನಕಲ್ಲೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಕುಶದೊಡ್ಡಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ತುಂಬಲು ಉಪ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಘೋಷಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೯೯೩ ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೫ ರ ಉಪ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೪ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ (ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು ೧೯೯೩ರ ನಿಯಮ ೭೬ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರದತ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಜಲಾಯಿಸಿ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆರ್.ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ನೇ. ಆದ ನಾನು ಸದರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತೀಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಆಯ್ದುಯಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು : ಮಾತ್ರ

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ : ರಾಯಚೂರು

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ	ಗ್ರ.ಹೆ ಹೆಸರು	ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಸರು	ಒಟ್ಟು ಸಾಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಕ ಸಾಧನಗಳು	ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರು	
೧	೨	೩	೪	೫	೬
೧	1-ಅಮೀನಗಡ	1-ಅಮೀನಗಡ-1	4	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಮೌನಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಅಮರೇಶ
೨				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಬೀಮೇಶಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಯಂಕಟ್ಪ್ಪ
೩				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಹುಸೇನಸಾಬ ತಂ ಖಾಜಾಸಾಬ
೪				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಅ.ಗಂಗಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಬಸವರಾಜ
೫		2-ಅಮೀನಗಡ-2	4	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಬನಲಿಂಗಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಭೀಮೆಣ್ಣ
೬				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಅಮರೇಗೌಡ ತಂ ಧನಶಂಕರಗೌಡ
೭				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಹಂಪಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ನಾಗೆಣ್ಣ
೮				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಈರಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಈರೇಶ
೯		1-ಕೋಟೆಕಲ್	2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಭೀಮಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಭೀಮೆಣ್ಣ
೧೦				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಯಲ್ಲಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಶಿವರಾಜ ಕಾವಲಿ
೧೧		4-ಕಾಬಾಪೂರ್	2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಶಿವರಾಜ ಗಂ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀಯ್ಯ
೧೨				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ದೇವಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಮುಖ್ಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ
೧೩		5-ಯಿತಗಲ್	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಮೌನೇಶ ತಂ ಚನ್ನಪ್ಪ
೧೪				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಗಂಗಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಮುಖ್ಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ
೧೫				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಜನ್ಮಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಶಿವರಾಜ
೧೬	2-ವಟಗಲ್	1-ವಟಗಲ್-1	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಬನಮ್ಮೆ ತಾಯಿ ಗಂಗಮ್ಮೆ
೧೭				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಶರಣಬಂಪಷ್ಟ ತಂ ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ

18	2-ವಂಗೆಲ್-2	2	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಚಂದ್ರಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಅಮರೇಗೌಡ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
19			ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಸೀತಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಬಸವರಾಜ ಪಂಡಾರಿ
20			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಆದನಗೌಡ ಎಮ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
21	2-ವಂಗೆಲ್	3-ಯಿತ್ತಾನವೂರು	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಶಿವಷ್ಟ ತಂ ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ
22			ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ' ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಹನುಮಂತಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ
23			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಅಮರಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ
24		4-ಇರಕೆಲ್	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ನೋಮ್ಮಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಹುಸೇನಪ್ಪ
25		5-ವರಸಾವೂರು	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ರುದ್ರಮ್ಮು
26		6-ಬನಾವೂರು	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ರಂಗಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ರಮೇಶ
27			ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ತಾಯಿಮ್ಮು / ಶಿಲ್ಷಾ ಗಂ ಅಳ್ಳಪ್ಪ
28			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಬಸನಗೌಡ ತಂ ಆದ್ವೆ ಬಾಲರೆಡ್ಡಿ
29			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಹನುಮಂತಿ ಗಂ ಹನುಮಂತ
30	3-ಪಾಮನಕಲ್ಲೂರು	1-ಪಾಮನಕಲ್ಲೂರು-1	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಬಸವರಾಜ ತಾಯಿ ಮಲ್ಲಮ್ಮು
31			ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ'	ದುರುಗಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಹುಲಗಪ್ಪ
32			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ವೇಂಕಟೇಶ ತಂ ಕರಿಬಸಪ್ಪ
33			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶಿವಲೀಲಾ ತಂ ಶಿವರುಮಾರ
34		2-ಪಾಮನಕಲ್ಲೂರು-2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಅಂಬಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಹುಸೇನಪ್ಪ
35			ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ' ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಖಾಜಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಲಾಜೆಸಾಬ
36			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ತಂ ಹುಸೇನಪ್ಪ
37			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ರೇಣುಕಾ ಗಂ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ
38		3-ಚೆಳ್ಳರಾಗಿ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ವಾರ್ಡೆಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಹುಲಗಪ್ಪ
39			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಬಸವಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ ತಂ ಜನ್ನಬಸಯ್ಯ
40		4-ತಪ್ಪದೂರು	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಲಜಮಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಅಮರಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕ
41			ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ'	ಕೆಂಜಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ
42			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಕರುಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ದುರುಗಪ್ಪ
43		5-ಬೆಂಜಮರದಿ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಶರಣಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಬಸಪ್ಪ
44			ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ 'ಬ' ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶಕುಂತಲಾ ಗಂ ನಾಗರಾಜ
45			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶಿದನಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ
46		6-ಹವಾಂಪೂರು	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಶಿವಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಮಾನಪ್ಪ
47			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಅಮರೇಶ ತಂ ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣ
48			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶಿಲ್ಷಾ ಗಂ ಆದೇಶ
49		7-ಗುಡಿಕಾಳ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಬಸಮ್ಮು ಗಂ ರಾಮಪ್ಪ
50			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಸ್ಯುಕೆಲ್ಲು ರಾಜಸಾಬ ತಂ ಹುಸೇನ ಸಾಬ

51	8-ಆನಂದಗೌಡ	4	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶ್ರೇತಾ ಗಂ ಅಮರೇಶ
52			ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ತಿಮ್ಮಿಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ವೇಂಕಟೇಶ
53			ಹಿಂದುಳಿ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ' ಮಹಿಳೆ	ರಿಯಾನ ಬೇಗಂ ಗಂ ಮಹಡ್‌ರಹಿ
54			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಶರಣಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಅಮರೇಗೌಡ
55			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶರಮ್ಮ ಹೋನ್ನಳಿ ಗಂ ವಿಶ್ವನಾಥ
56	11-ಅಂತರ್ಭೇದಾದ್ವಿ	1-ಅಂತರ್ಭೇದಾದ್ವಿ-1	ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ' ಮಹಿಳೆ	ರೇಖಾಕಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಮಾನಯ್ಯ
57			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಬಸವರಾಜ ತಂ ಅಂಬಣ್ಣ
58			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಚಂದ್ರಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಲಿಂಗೇಶ
59		2-ಅಂತರ್ಭೇದಾದ್ವಿ-2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಸಂದರ್ಭಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ
60			ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ದೊಡ್ಡಬಸಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಯಂಕಪ್ಪ
61			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಅಮರಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಶಿವಗೇನಪ್ಪ ಹೋನಮನಿ
62	11-ಅಂತರ್ಭೇದಾದ್ವಿ	3-ಸಾನಭಾಜ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಘಕೀರಪ್ಪ
63			ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ದ್ವಾರ್ಡ್ಯಾಂಜಿ ಗಂ ಶರಣಪ್ಪ
64		4-ಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣಿ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಬಸಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ರಮೇಶ ಭಟಂತ್ರಿ
65			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಗುರುರಾಜ ತಂ ರಾಮರಾಂ ದೇಸಾಯಿ
66			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಹಂಡಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ
67		5-ಹೊವಿನಭಾವಿ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಆದಪ್ಪ ತಂ ಹನುಮಂತ
68			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಮಲ್ಲಮ್ಮೆ ತಂ ಹಿರೇ ರಾಮಣ್ಣ
69			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಮಲ್ಲಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಅಮರಪ್ಪ
70		6-ಕಾಟಗೌಡ	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ರೇಖಾಕಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಹನುಮಂತ
71			ಹಿಂದುಳಿ ವರ್ಗ 'ಅ'	ನೂರನಾಬ ತಂ ಹುಸೇನ ನಾಬ
72			ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಅಮರಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂ ಅಮರೇಶ
73		7-ಕಾಟಗೌಡ	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾಬುನ ತಂ ಸಿದ್ದನಗೌಡ

(ಆರೋವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ಸೆ.)

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ರಾಯಚೂರು.

PR-262

### ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ರಾಯಚೂರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಂದಾಯ/ಚುನಾವಣೆ/ಗ್ರಾ.ಪಂ/44/2020-21

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 09 - 04 -2021

#### ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ರಾಜ್ (ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1993 ರ 12ನೇ ನಿಯಮದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾದ ಈ ಕಥೆಗಳಿಯ ಸಮಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ:12-03-2021ರ ವ್ರೇತಾರ 2021ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಧಿ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಿವಾದ ರಾಯಚೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಲಿಂಗಸೂಗೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ರೋಡೆಲಬಂಡಾ (ತ) ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತ ನಡಸ್ಯಾರನ್ನ ತುಂಬಲು ಉಪ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನ ನಡೆಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಫೋನ್‌ಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಕನಾಕಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಧಿನೀಯಮು ೧೯೯೩ ರ ವ್ಯಕ್ತರಣ ೫ ರ ಉಪ ವ್ಯಕ್ತರಣ ೪ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕನಾಕಟಕ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರ ರಾಜ್ಯ (ಖೂನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು ೧೯೯೩ರ ನಿಯಮ ೭೬ರ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚೆಲಾಯಿಸಿ ರಾಯಚೋರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆರ್.ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ನೇ. ಅದ ನಾನು ನಡರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಅಯ್ಯಿಯಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು : ಲಿಂಗನೂಗೂರು

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ : ರಾಯಚೋರು

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ	ಗ್ರ.ಪಂ ಹೆಸರು	ಹೈತ್ರೆಡ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಸರು	ಒಟ್ಟು ಸಾಫಾನಗಳು	ಮೀನಲಿರಿಸಿದ ಸಾಫಾನಗಳು	ಖೂನಾಯಿತ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರು
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	16-ರೋಡಲಬಂಡಾ (ತ)	1-ರೋಡಲಬಂಡಾ-1	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಗಿರಿಜಮ್ ಗಂಡ ಸಂಗಂಬಸಪ್ಪ
2				ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ “ಅ” ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶರೀಯಾಬೇಗಂ ಗಂಡ ನಾದಿಕ್
3				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಸೋಎಮಂಜೀಲಿರಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಅಪ್ಪಾರಾವ್
4		2-ರೋಡಲಬಂಡಾ-2	3	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಹುಲುಗೆಮ್ ಗಂಡ ಈರಪ್ಪ
5				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ರೇಣುಕಮ್ ಗಂಡ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ
6				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ
7		3-ಯಲಗಣ್ಯ-1	4	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶರಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಅರ್ಪಪ್ಪ
8				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಮಂಜುಳಾ ಗಂಡ ಏರನಗೌಡ
9				ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗ “ಅ”	ರಾಘವೇಂದ್ರ ತಂದೆ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ
10				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಚಾಂದಪಾಷ ತಂದೆ ಅಭುಲ್ ರೆಹಮಾನ್
11		4-ಯಲಗಣ್ಯ-2	4	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿ	ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಶಿವಪ್ಪ
12				ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಚನ್ನಮ್ ಗಂಡ ವಡಿಕೆಪ್ಪ
13				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಸಹದೇವ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ
14				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಅಂಬಮ್ ಗಂಡ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ
15	5-ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪಾರು	2	2	ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಪಂಗಡ	ಯಂಕಮ್ ಗಂಡ ವಂದ್ಯಾಯ್
16				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಶರಣಮ್ ಗಂಡ ಬಸವಂತಪ್ಪ
17	6-ಕಡ್ಡೋಣ	1	1	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ಪವಿತ್ರ ಗಂಡ ಬಸವರಾಜ್
	7-ತವಗ	2	2	ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಹಿಳೆ	ದೊಡ್ಡಮ್ ಗಂಡ ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪ
				ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ	ಸಿದ್ದಣ ತಂದೆ ಬಸಣ್

(ಆರ್.ವೆಂಕಟೇಶ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಭಾ.ಆ.ನೇ.)

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಖೂನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ರಾಯಚೋರು.

ಃ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ೃ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ/ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಸ್ವ/ಸಾ/7/2010-1

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 20-06-2021

ಹೊಸ ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ-1894 ರ ಕಲಂ. 16(2) ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಅಧಿನೂಚನೆ

ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 17/1961 ರಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುವಡಿಯಾದಂತೆ, ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 1894 ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಕಲಂ 16ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ (2) ಉಪಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಈ ಮುಂದಿನ ಅನುಚಾಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜಮಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಅಳವಂಡಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಳವಂಡಿ ಕೆರೆಯ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನದ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರಕರಣ 6ರ ಉಪಪ್ರಕರಣ (1) ರಲ್ಲಿ ವಶಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದವರ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿನೂಚನೆನ್ನು ನೀಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಃ ಅನುನೂಚಿ ೩

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ: ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ	ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು: ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ	ಹೋಬಳಿ: ಅಳವಂಡಿ	ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಅಳವಂಡಿ			
ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಸ.ನಂ. ಪರಣ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಜೆವಂಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಸ.ನಂ. ಪರಣ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಜೆವಂಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	49/*/ಅ	49/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	02-05	26-05-2010	ಜಾಫರಸಾಬ ತಂದೆ ಮದರಸಾಬ ಮುಲ್ಲಾ
2	49/*/ಇ	49/2	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	01-00	26-05-2010	ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ತಂದೆ ವೀರಣ್ಣ ಅಂಗಡಿ
3	49/*೩೦	49/3	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	01-00	26-05-2010	ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ತಂದೆ ವೀರಣ್ಣ ಅಂಗಡಿ
4	86/*/೧	86/8	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	02-20	26-05-2010	ಬಸವ್ಯ ಗಂಡ ಭರಮಪ್ಪ ಹೊಳಗುಂದಿ
5	86/*೩	86/9	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	01-00	26-05-2010	ನಂಗಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ
6	86/*/೬	86/7	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	02-00	26-05-2010	ನರಸಿಂಗ ತಂದೆ ರಾಯಮಲ್ಲಜೀ ರಾಜಪೂರೋಹಿತ
7	87/ಅ	87/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	02-00	26-05-2010	ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ತಂದೆ ವೀರಣ್ಣ ಅಂಗಡಿ
8	87/ಆ	87/2	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	00-30	26-05-2010	ಬಸಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ಅಡವಳ್ಳಿ
9	87/ಆ	87/3	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	00-30	26-05-2010	ಗವಿಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ಅಡವಳ್ಳಿ
10	87/ಆ	87/4	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	00-30	26-05-2010	ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ಅಡವಳ್ಳಿ
11	89/*/*	89/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	05-00	26-05-2010	1]ಕೋಟ್ಯಯ್ಯ 2]ಶೇವರಯ್ಯ 3]ವಿರಪಾಕ್ಷಯ್ಯ 4]ವೀರಯ್ಯ
12	284/*/*	284/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	10-06	26-05-2010	ವೆಂಕರೆಡ್ಡಿ ಹನುಮರೆಡ್ಡಿ ಕಲಾದಗಿ
13	285/*/*	285/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	00-20	26-05-2010	ಶಾಂತಪ್ಪ ಕಳಕಪ್ಪ ಉಳ್ಳಾಗಡಿ
14	285/*/*	285/2	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	02-25	26-05-2010	ಶಿವಪ್ರಕಾಶ ತಂದೆ ಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಸ್ವಾಮಿ
15	285/*/ಅ	285/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	02-08	26-05-2010	1]ಶ್ರೀಶೈಲಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ಹೊಳಜಿ 2]ಗವಿಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ಹೊಳಜಿ
16	285/*/ಆ	285/2	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	01-20	26-05-2010	ಶರಣಯ್ಯ ತಂದೆ ಶಿಳಿಂಗಯ್ಯ ತುಪ್ಪದಮತ
17	286/*/*	286/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	01-20	26-05-2010	ಗವಿಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಮುಢಪ್ಪ ಸೋಮನಕಟ್ಟಿ
18	332/*/ಆ	332/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	00-15	26-05-2010	ಬಾದರಸಾಬ ಮೀಯಾಸಾಬ
19	335/*/ಆ	335/1	ಖುಷ್ತಿ	01-00	26-05-2010	1]ಯಮನೂರಸಾಬ ಫೀರಸಾಬ 2]ಸೋಮ ಅಲ್ಲಾಸಾಬ ಮುಢಪ್ಪ

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಸ.ನಂ. ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜೆಲಂಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹ	ಸ್ಥಾಧಿನೆಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ	ಸ್ಥಾಧಿನೆ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	335/*/ಕ್ಷಃ	335/2	ಮುಷ್ಟಿ	02-00	26-05-2010	1]ಫೀರಸಾಬ ಫಕೀರಸಾಬ ಹಿಂಜಾರ 2]ಮಾಸೀನಸಾಬ ಫಕೀರಸಾಬ ಹಿಂಜಾರ
			ಒಟ್ಟು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ	40-29		

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು  
ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

**PR-264**

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ/ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಸ್ವಾ/ನಾ/18/2006-07

ದಿನಾಂಕ:-20-06-2021

ಹೊನ ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧಿನ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ-1894 ರ ಕಲಂ. 16(2) ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 17/1961ರಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾದಂತೆ, ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧಿನ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ 1894 ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಕಲಂ 16ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ (2) ಉಪಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಈ ಮುಂದಿನ ಅನುಚೂಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ನಾವ್ಯಜಮಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಭೀಮನೂರು ಹಾಗೂ ಹಾಲಹಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಗೆಬ್ಬಾರ ಕೆರೆಯ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧಿನದ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರಕರಣ 6ರ ಉಪ ಪ್ರಕರಣ(1)ರಲ್ಲಿ ವಶಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಂದು ನಾವ್ಯಜನಿಕರ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದವರ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆನ್ನು ನೀಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅನುಸೂಚಿ

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ: ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು: ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಭೀಮನೂರು & ಹಾಲಹಳ್ಳಿ

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಸ.ನಂ. ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜೆಲಂಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹ	ಸ್ಥಾಧಿನೆಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ	ಸ್ಥಾಧಿನೆ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಭೀಮನೂರು

1	8	8	ಮುಷ್ಟಿ	01-28 00-05ಪಿಕೆ 01-23	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಹೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
2	9	9	ಮುಷ್ಟಿ	01-07 00-03ಪಿಕೆ 01-04	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಹೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
3	10	10	ಮುಷ್ಟಿ	01-24 00-08ಪಿಕೆ 01-16	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಹೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ನಂ. ಪತ್ರ	ಚೆಲಂಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ಥಾದಿನಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವೀಕ್ಷಣೆ	ಸ್ಥಾದಿನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	11	11	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-31 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 01-25	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
5	12	12	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-00 00-07ಪಿಕೆ 01-33	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
6	13	13	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	03-20	07-12-2006	ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಗಾಯರಾಣ
7	14	14	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-10 00-07ಪಿಕೆ 02-03	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
8	15	15	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-37 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 01-31	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
9	16	16	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-36 00-05ಪಿಕೆ 01-31	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
10	17	17	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-01 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 01-35	07-12-2006	ಕರಿಯಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ದುರಗಪ್ಪ ಹರಿಜನ
11	18	18	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-34 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 01-28	07-12-2006	ಗಾಳೇವ್ವ ಗಂಡ ಹನಮಪ್ಪ ಹರಿಜನ
12	19	19	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-17 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 02-09	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
13	20	20	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-34 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 01-28	07-12-2006	ಫೆರೆರಮ್ಮ ಗಂಡ ಹನಮಗೌಡ
14	21	21	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-16	07-12-2006	ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಗಾಯರಾಣ
15	22	22	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-31 00-04ಪಿಕೆ 01-27	07-12-2006	ಪಾಮಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ ಕಲಾಲ
16	23	23	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-26 00-03ಪಿಕೆ 01-23	07-12-2006	ಹನಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯುಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಸ.ನಂ. ಪರ್ಯಾಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಚೆಲಂಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವೀಕ್ಷೆಣ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	24	24	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-05	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
18	25/ಎ	25/ಎ	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-17	07-12-2006	ನೀಲವ್ವೆ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕುರಿ
19	25/ಬಿ	25/ಬಿ	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-17	07-12-2006	ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕುರಿ
20	26/ಎ/ಬಿ	26/ಎ	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-08	07-12-2006	ನೀಲವ್ವೆ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕುರಿ
21	26/ಬಿ	26/ಬಿ	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-07	07-12-2006	ಭೋಜಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕುರಿ
22	27	27	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-04 00-04ಪಿಕೆ 02-00	07-12-2006	1]ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ 2]ಹಂಪವ್ವೆ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
23	28/ಎ,ಬಿ	28	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-14	07-12-2006	1]ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ 2]ಹಂಪವ್ವೆ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
24	29/ಎ	29	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-37 00-03ಪಿಕೆ 00-34	07-12-2006	ಹಂಪವ್ವೆ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
25	29/ಬಿ	29	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-37 00-03ಪಿಕೆ 00-34	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
26	30/ಎ	30	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-08 00-03ಪಿಕೆ 01-05	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
27	30/ಬಿ	30	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-07 00-02ಪಿಕೆ 01-05	07-12-2006	ಹಂಪವ್ವೆ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
28	31/ಸಿ	31	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-18 00-03ಪಿಕೆ 01-15	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
29	32	32	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	01-31 00-05ಪಿಕೆ 01-26	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್
30	33	33	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	11-28	07-12-2006	ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಗಾಯರಾಜ್
31	33/ಘೇ	33	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-26	07-12-2006	ಹಾಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಬಂಗಾರೆಪ್ಪ ಕಲಾಲ

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಸ.ನಂ.	ಚೆಲಂಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವೀಕ್ಷೆಣ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	34	34/4	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	05-09 00-06ಪಿಕೆ 05-03	07-12-2006	1]ದೊಡ್ಡಫೆರಪ್ಪ ಬಸಪ್ಪ 2]ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಬಸಪ್ಪ 3]ನಣ್ಣ ಫೆರಪ್ಪ ಬಸಪ್ಪ 4]ಯಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಬಸಪ್ಪ
33	35/ಎ 35/ಇ 35/ಸಿ	35/4 35/5 35/6	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	09-15	07-12-2006	ಅನನೂಯ ಗಂಡ ಶರಣಬಸವರಾಜ
34	38/ಎ	38/2	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	03-00 00-23ಪಿಕೆ 02-17	07-12-2006	1]ಅಪ್ಪನಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಂತಗೌಡ 2]ಬಸನಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಂತಗೌಡ 3]ಪೇಮವ್ವ ಗಂಡ ಭೀಮನಗೌಡ 4]ಮಲ್ಲನಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಂತಗೌಡ
35	39	39/2	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	00-15	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಗೌಡ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗೌಡ ಮೋಲಿನ್ ವಾಟೀಲ್
-	-	-	ಒಟ್ಟು ಪಿಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನಿವ್ವಳ ಕೇತ್ತೆ	74-27 03-12 16-24 54-31	-	-

## ಗ್ರಾಮ : ಹಾಲಹಳ್ಳಿ

36	100	100/2	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	00-22	07-12-2006	ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ ಗಿಣಿಗೇರಾ
37	101/ಎ	101/2	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	01-14	07-12-2006	1]ಹಾಲಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ 2]ಭರಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ 3]ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ 4] ಹುಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಸಣ್ಣಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕೊರವರ 5]ನಣ್ಣ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕೊರವರ 6]ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕೊರವರ
38	102/1	102/1	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	02-35	07-12-2006	ದುರಗಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹುಲಗಪ್ಪ ಮಾಡರೆ
39	102/2	102/2	ಎಣ್ಣೆ	04-00 00-02ಪಿಕೆ 03-38	07-12-2006	ಕೊರಪ್ಪ ತಾಯಿ ಹುಲಿಗಪ್ಪ ಹರಿಜನ

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ನಂ. ಪರ್ಯಾಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಚೆಲಂಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ಥಾದ್ವಿನಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾದ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ	ಸ್ಥಾದ್ವಿನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40	102/3	102/1	ಎಷ್ಟು	02-04 00-01ಪಿಕೆ 02-03	07-12-2006	1]ಯಮನಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಭೂತ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ 2]ಮರಗಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಹಾಲಪ್ಪ
41	102/4	102/4	ಎಷ್ಟು	02-29 00-02ಪಿಕೆ 02-27	07-12-2006	ಎಂಪ್ಪೆ ಗಂಡ ದುರಗಪ್ಪ ಹರಿಜನ
42	103	103	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-20	07-12-2006	ಸಕಾರ ಗಾಯರಾಣ
43	104/1	104/1	ಎಷ್ಟು	02-00	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ಇಂದರಗಿ
44	104/2	104/1	ಎಷ್ಟು	04-36	07-12-2006	1]ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಪ್ಪ ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ಹಾಲಹಳ್ಳಿ 2]ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕೊರವರ
45	104/3	104/2	ಎಷ್ಟು	03-15 00-15ಪಿಕೆ 03-00	07-12-2006	ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಶಿವಪ್ಪ
46	104/4	104/3	ಎಷ್ಟು	03-12 00-12ಪಿಕೆ 03-00	07-12-2006	ಸಂಜಜೀವಮ್ಮೆ ಗಂಡ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ
47	105/ಎ	105	ಎಷ್ಟು	01-20	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಘಕೀರಪ್ಪ ಬಸಾಮೋರ
48	105/ಹಿ12	105	ಎಷ್ಟು	02-00 00-04ಪಿಕೆ 01-36	07-12-2006	ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ಕೊರವರ
49	105/ಹಿ	105	ಎಷ್ಟು	02-17	07-12-2006	1]ಯಮನಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ನಾಗಪ್ಪ 2]ಶಿವಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ 3]ಹಾಲಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ಕೋರವರ
50	106/ಎ,ಹಿ	106	ಎಷ್ಟು	06-20	07-12-2006	1]ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಗಿಣಗೇರಾ 2]ಕಳಕಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ನಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಗಿಣಗೇರಾ
51	107/ಎ1	107	ಎಷ್ಟು	01-10	07-12-2006	ಬಾಷುಸಾಬ ತಂದೆ ಹುಸೇನಸಾಬ
-	-	-	ಒಟ್ಟು ಪಿಕೆ ಸಕಾರ ನಿವ್ವಳ ಕೇತ್ತ	41-14 00-36 05-16 35-02	-	-

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು  
ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ, ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ನಂಖೆ/ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಸ್ವ/ನಾ/03/2017-18

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 20-06-2021

ಹೊನ ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ-2013 ರ ಕಲಂ. 38(1) ರಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾರದರ್ಶಕತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಪರಿಹಾರದ ಹಕ್ಕು ಪುನರ್ವಸತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪುನರ್ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಕಾರ್ಯ-2013 ರಷ್ಟು ಕಲಂ. 38 ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣ (1) ಉಪ-ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಈ ಮುಂದಿನ ಅನುಸೂಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾದ ಜರ್ಮಿನನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಕನಕಗಿರಿ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಆದಾಮೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜರ್ಮಿನಗಳನ್ನು ಆದಾಮೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಕೆರೆ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದರಿ ನಿಯಮ 30ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾದ ಐತಿಹ್ಯನ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ (3) ತಿಂಗಳ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಪರಿಹಾರಧನವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಮರುವಸತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪುನರ್ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂದಾಯ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದವರ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ನೀಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

## :: ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ::

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ: ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ		ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು: ಕನಕಗಿರಿ		ಹೋಬಳಿ: ನವಲಿ		ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಆದಾಮೂರ	
ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.	ಜೆ.ವಿಂಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಜರ್ಮಿನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ವಾಧೀನತಾ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಎಕರೆ-ಗುಂಟಿ	ಕಬ್ಜ್ಜಿ ಪಡೆದ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಆದಾಮೂರ							
1	2/1	2/2	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	05-21	26-02-2009	ಬಸನ್ಗೌಡ ತಂಡೆ ಮುಳ್ಳಿಕಾಜುನ್ಗೌಡ	
2	4/1	4/1	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-04	26-02-2009	ಪರಮಣ್ಣ ತಂಡೆ ಅಯ್ಯಪ್ಪ	
3	4/3	4/3	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	00-30	26-02-2009	ಭೋಗಪ್ಪ ತಂಡೆ ಹುಡ್ಡಪ್ಪ	
4	5/1	5/1	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-3-5	26-02-2009	ಯಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ತಂಡೆ ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ	
5	5/2	5/2	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-3-5	26-02-2009	ಸಣ್ಣ ರಾಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡೆ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ	
6	6/ಹಿ2	6/ಹಿ2	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	04-38	26-02-2009	ಲಜಮಪ್ಪ ಗಂಡ ಯಂಕಪ್ಪ	
7	6/ಹಿ1	6/ಹಿ1	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	04-38	26-02-2009	ಭತ್ತಪ್ಪ ತಂಡೆ ಶೇಷಪ್ಪ	
8	6	6	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	10-03	26-02-2009	ಸಕಾರಿ ಬಾರಿಜ ಬಾತಾ	
9	12	12	ಖುಣ್ಣಿ	02-21	26-02-2009	ದೊಡ್ಡ ಬಸಪ್ಪ ತಂಡೆ ತಿಮ್ಮಣಿ	
ಒಟ್ಟು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ				33-02	-	-	

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು

ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ, ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ/ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಸ್ವಾ/ನಾ/06/2014-15

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 20-06-2021

ಹೊನ ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧಿನ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ-2013 ರ ಕಲಂ. 38(1) ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧಿನ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರದರ್ಶಕತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಪರಿಹಾರದ ಹಕ್ಕು ಪ್ರಾಣವಸತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪುನರ್ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಕಾರ್ಯ-2013 ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಕಲಂ. 38 ರ ಪ್ರಕರಣ (1) ಉಪ-ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಮೇಲೆಗೆ ಈ ಮುಂದಿನ ಅನುಸೂಚಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಕನಕಗಿರಿ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಗೌರಿಪೂರ ಮತ್ತು ಬಸರಿಹಾಳ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಗೌರಿಪೂರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಜಿನಗು ಕೆರೆ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ (ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೇತು) ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧಿನವಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದರಿ ನಿಯಮ 30ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾದ ಎತ್ತಿರೀತಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ (3) ತಿಂಗಳ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾಣ ಪರಿಹಾರಧನವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಮರುವಸತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮನರ್ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂದಾಯ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದವರ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ನೀಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

:: ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ::

ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ: ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು: ಕನಕಗಿರಿ

ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಗೌರಿಪೂರ &amp; ಬಸರಿಹಾಳ

ಕ್ರ.ನಂ.	ನಂಬೆ ನಂ. ಪರಂಜಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಜೀವಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ವಾಧಿನತಾ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಎಕರೆ-ಗುಂಟೆ	ಕೆಬ್ಬಿ ಪಡೆದ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಗೌರಿಪೂರ						
1	40/ಈ	40/ಈ	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-05	16-10-2009	ರಾಮನಗರ ತಂಡ ಸಣ್ಣ ದ್ಯಾಮನಗರ
2	41/ಈ	41/ಈ	ಎಷ್ಟು	01-02	16-10-2009	ಶಿವಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಕನಕಪ್ಪ
3	45/ಇ,ಲು, ಉಂ	45/ಇ,ಲು, ಉಂ	ಎಷ್ಟು	01-18	16-10-2009	ಸೋಮಗಳ ತಂಡ ಬಾಳನಗರ
4	46	46	ಎಷ್ಟು	01-04	16-10-2009	ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಮಾಳಪ್ಪ
	ಒಟ್ಟು ಹೇತು			03-29		
ಗ್ರಾಮ: ಬಸರಿಹಾಳ						
1	13	13	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-14	16-10-2009	ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಅಯ್ಯಪ್ಪ
2	13/ಹಿ4	13/ಹಿ4	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-04	16-10-2009	ಗ್ರಾನಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮಣಿ
3	13/ಹಿ1	13/ಹಿ1	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-14	16-10-2009	ಬೆಟ್ಟಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ
4	13/ಹಿ2	13/ಹಿ2	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-06	16-10-2009	ಕೆಳಕಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ
5	13/ಹಿ3	13/ಹಿ3	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-07	16-10-2009	ಬಸವಂತಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಕನಕಪ್ಪ
6	13/ಹಿ4	13/ಹಿ4	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-04	16-10-2009	ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮಣಿ
7	13/ಹಿ4	13/ಹಿ4	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-04	16-10-2009	ಅಂಬೇಶ್ವರ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮಣಿ
8	14/ಡ	14/ಡ	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-35	16-10-2009	ಯಮನಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮಣಿ, ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಬಿಡ್ಡಪ್ಪ
9	14/ಕ	14/ಕ	ಎಷ್ಟು	01-34	16-10-2009	1]ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ 2]ಮಾನಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ 3]ದ್ಯಾಮಣಿ ತಂಡ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ 4]ಫಕೇರಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಯಮನಪ್ಪ
10	15/ಕ	15/ಕ	ಎಷ್ಟು	00-22	16-10-2009	ದ್ಯಾಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಕೀರೇಹನುಮಪ್ಪ

ಭಾಗ ೬-ಸಿ

ಕನಾಡಕ ರಾಜ್ಯಪತ್ರ, ಶುಕ್ರವಾರ, ೨೫. ಜೂನ್ ೨೦೧೦

೧೨೨

ಕ್ರ.ನಂ.	ನಂಖೆ ನಂ. ಪರ್ಯಾಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಜೊಲಾಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನ.ನಂ.	ಜಮೀನಿನ ತರಹೆ	ಸ್ಥಾದ್ವಿನತಾ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಎಕರೆ-ಗುಂಟಿ	ಕಬ್ಜಿ ಪಡೆದ ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	15/ಬಿ	15/ಬಿ	ಎಷ್ಟಿ	00-14 00-21 00-32	16-10-2009	1]ನ್ಯಾನ್‌ಪ್ಪೆ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ 2]ದೇವಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಮುಕ್ಕಾಲಪ್ಪ 3]ಹಿರೇಂದ್ರಾಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಮುಕ್ಕಾಲಪ್ಪ 4]ನಳ್ಳಿ ದ್ಯಾಮಣಿ ತಂಡ ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ
12	16/ಅ	16/ಅ	ಎಷ್ಟಿ	01-08	16-10-2009	ನಾಗವ್ಯಾ ಗಂಡ ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ವೆಂಕಲಕುಂಟು
13	17/ಬಿ	17/ಬಿ	ಎಷ್ಟಿ	00-04	16-10-2009	ಬಸವರಾಜ ತಂಡ ಸಗರಪ್ಪ ಜಗ್ಗರ
14	17/ಅ/1	17/ಅ/1	ಎಷ್ಟಿ	00-05	16-10-2009	ಹನುಮಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ದ್ಯಾಮಪ್ಪ
15	19/ಒ/1	19/ಒ/1	ಎಷ್ಟಿ	00-13	16-10-2009	ಬಾಲಪ್ಪ ತಂಡ ಬಾಳಪ್ಪ
			ಒಟ್ಟು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ	08-01		
			ಸಮರ್ಪ ಒಟ್ಟು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ:	11-30		

ಚಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು  
 ಹೊರ್ವಾಳ

**PR-267**